DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 665 RC 016 454

TITLE	Community Leadership Development: Present and Future. Publication #50. A Report by the National Extension Task Force for Community Leadership. For the Community Resource Development/Public Affairs Subcommittee of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP).
INSTITUTION	Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development, University Park, PA.
PUB DATE	Nov 87
NOTE	33p.; For related document, see RC 016 455.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Development; *Community Leaders; Educational Planning; *Extension Education; *Inservice Education; Leaders; *Leadership Training; *Networks; Program Development; Rural Development
IDENTIFIERS	Community Development Specialists; *Cooperative Extension Service; Leadership Development Program

ABSTRACT

This publication reports accomplishments of the National Extension Task Force for Community Leadership and makes recommendations for strengthening educational programming in community leadership in the Cooperative Extension System. The recommendations are presented in the context of a "white paper" rather than formal policy. High priority recommendations include maintaining a national leadership networking system for professionals, strengthening/supporting the national program leader position for community leadership, encouraging/supporting basic and applied research on community leadership, developing leadership programs to complement educational programs conducted for community leaders, and providing senior administrative support for community leadership programming. To help provide professionals and lay leaders with information that will help link current leadership programming issues, topics, trends, and examples of programming, six articles are included: "Leadership Development: The Need and Response" (B. Ghiselin); "Working with Our Publics: In-Service Education for Cooperative Extension" (E. Boone); "Developing Leadership" (L. Cary et al.); "Leadership Development and Public Policy Education: A Look at the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy" (J. Kornacki); "Research-Practice Linkages in Community Leadership Development: Results of a National Study" (F. Fear et al.); and "Family Community Leadership" (L. Bassett and J. Barron). (NEC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED288665

Community Leadership Development

Present and Future

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Daryl K. Heasley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

OCT 27 1987
RECEIVED
ERIC/CRESS

RC016454

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Community Leadership Development
Present and Future

A Report by the National Extension Task Force for Community Leadership

For The Community Resource Development/Public Affairs Subcommittee
of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP)

Publications Committee: Harriett Moyer, Chair; Daryl Heasley, and John Tait

Published by the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development
University Park, PA 16802

Publication #50

November 1987

Table of Contents

Executive Summary 1
Major Accomplishments 1
Recommendations 1

Foreword 1
Community Leadership and the National Initiatives 1

Acknowledgments 2

Introduction 2
Task Force Background Activities 2
Task Force Membership 2
Purpose of This Publication 3

Accomplishments and Recommendations of the Task Force 3
Accomplishments 3
Evaluation of Conference and Networking 4
Methodology 4
Findings 4

Recommendations 5
High Priority 6
Priority 6

Community Leadership Trends, Topics, and Programming 7

Leadership Development: The Need and Response 8
The Context 8
Design and Methodology 9
Hot Topics 10
References 12

Working with Our Publics: In-Service Education for Cooperative Extension Overview of the Project 13
What Is This Project? 13
What Are These Training Modules? 13
Module 1: Understanding the Land-Grant University and Its Mission in Contemporary Society 14
Module 2: Understanding Cooperative Extension 14
Module 3: The Extension Education Process 14
Module 4: Developing Leadership 14
Module 5: Situational Analysis 14
Module 6: Working with Groups and Organizations 14
Module 7: Education for Public Decisions 14
Module 8: Analytic Techniques for Future Programming 14
What Will These Materials Look Like? 14
What Has Been Involved in This Project? 15
What Are the Benefits to Extension? 15

Developing Leadership 17
Introduction to Leadership Module 17
Learning Objectives 18

Leadership Development and Public Policy Education: A Look at the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy 19
Background 19
Resources for the Future 19
National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy 19
The Leadership Development Program 20
Conclusion 20
References 20

Research-Practice Linkages in Community Leadership Development: Results of a National Study 21
Background 21
Study Purpose 21
Study Methods 21
Sample Selection Process 21
Data Collection Instrument 22
Data Collection Process 22
Profile of the Respondents 22
Theoretical Preferences for Defining Community Leadership 22
The Substance of CLD Programs 23
The Process of Designing CLD Programs 23
Theoretical Preferences for Defining Leadership and for Specific Leadership Concepts 24
Assessment of the Current Research-Practice Linkage in CLD 25
Conclusions and Recommendations 26
References 27

Family Community Leadership 28
What Is FCL? 28
Who Can Participate? 28
Why Is FCL Special? 28
How Does It Work? 28
What Is Taught? 28
Goals of the FCL Program 28
How Is FCL Funded? 28
Main Elements of the FCL Project 28
The Past 28
The Present 29
The Future 29

Executive Summary

The purpose of this executive summary is to highlight the accomplishments and recommendations of the task force.

Major Accomplishments

- Completion of a national survey to determine the characteristics of Extension people who are programming in leadership development.
- Sponsorship of a national conference to organize an ongoing community leadership network and to present current programming concepts and materials.
- Organization of seven interest groups whose efforts focused on various aspects of community leadership.
- Organization of a national network on community leadership.
- Production of conference proceedings.
- Production of a maintenance plan to ensure the continuation of networking on community leadership.
- Publication of two booklets designed to update Extension community leadership programmers.
- Formulation of recommendations to the ECOP CRD/PA Subcommittee.

Recommendations

From analysis of national survey data, the National Extension Task Force on Community Leadership makes the following recommendations for strengthening educational programming in community leadership in the Cooperative Extension System.

High Priority:

- Maintain a National Leadership Networking System for Extension professionals.
- Strengthen and support the National Program Leader Position for Community Leadership.
- Encourage and Support Basic and Applied Research on Community Leadership.
- Develop Leadership Programs to Complement Educational Programs Conducted for Community Leaders, Particularly in Rural Areas.
- Provide Senior Administrative Support for Community Leadership Programming.

Priority:

- Develop In-Service Education on Community Leadership for Extension Professionals.
- Encourage Networking with Non-Extension Groups and Organizations.

Foreword

Community Leadership and the National Initiatives

In mid-1986, a National Priorities Policy Task Force jointly appointed by the Extension Service, the USDA, and the Extension Service Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) established a process and identified eight priority initiatives for the Cooperative Extension System:

- Improving Competitiveness and Profitability in American Agriculture
- Protecting Water Quality
- Improving Nutrition, Diet, and Health
- Revitalizing Rural America
- Creating Alternative Agricultural Opportunities
- Supporting Conservation and Management of Natural Resources
- Promoting Family and Economic Well-Being
- Building Human Capital

The eight national initiatives are creating a new agenda for the Cooperative Extension System. One of the most important keys to implementing these initiatives will be community leadership. As a first step, we must understand the dynamics of today's decision-making and formulate a vision of the future. These dynamics include community survival in a highly complex and integrated society, competition for jobs and income in a global economy, and informed public decisions based on the latest technical skills and specialized information.

Among the critical issues facing Americans now and in the future are (1) improving the economic efficiency and integration of the total agricultural system from producer to consumer; (2) protecting water quality; (3) improving human nutrition and meeting the food quality and safety needs of consumers and producers; (4) diversifying the rural economic base and developing new sources of employment income; (5) creating alternative agricultural opportunities; (6) managing and conserving natural resources; (7) addressing the societal issues of inadequate parental care and guidance, the dependent elderly, housing and health care, disruption and dislocation of rural families, alcohol and drug abuse, and financial stability; and (8) building the human and intellectual capacity of both youth and adults to ensure Amer-

ican competitiveness and quality of life into the twenty-first century.

Public policy decisions will be involved in many of these issues. Community leaders, potential leaders, and informed citizens will need to sharpen their skills and abilities to analyze policy issues, evaluate and recommend alternatives, and participate in the public policy decision-making process. Leadership and organizational development skills will be essential.

Rural America's survial depends a great deal on the enlightened perspective of creative local leaders, who are currently shaping the future of their communities. The Cooperative Extension System has a vital role of play in its continuing effort to strengthen educational opportunities in community leadership for its publics.

Acknowledgments

The task force worked as a team to accomplish its charge as set forth in the following introduction. However, special recognition is accorded John Michael, who provided leadership to the task force in its evaluation of the national conference, which was designed to organize an ongoing community leadership network. This evaluation formed the basis of many recommendations made by the task force.

The task force also gratefully acknowledges the help of the Southern Regional Center for Rural Development during the national conference, as well as the continued support of the Western, North Central, and Northeast Regional Centers for Rural Development. The Task Force owes special thanks to the Northeast Center for ensuring the printing of this publication.

Introduction

Community Leadership Development: Present and Future stems from the work of the National Extension Task Force for Community Leadership, which was appointed in 1984 by the Community Resource Development/Public Affairs Subcommittee of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP). The ECOP CRD/PA Subcommittee charged the task force with the following:

- Identify appropriate Extension staff in all program areas, as well as research and non-Extension persons involved in community leadership programming.
- Provide leadership in establishing an ongoing system of sharing information on community leadership programs of interest to Cooperative Extension.
- For state Extension systems, the Regional Community Resource Development Committee, and the ECOP CRD/PA Subcommittee, identify and recommend potential areas for program development and evaluation.
- Seek possible sources of private or public funding for network development (See the foreword in the task force's 1986 report, *Community Leadership Development: Implications for Extension.*).

The ECOP CRD/PA Subcommittee's charge to this task force has become significantly more important with the establishment of the ES 1988-1991 national initiatives. The success of any and all national initiatives depends upon the abilities of citizens in rural communities to influence group decision making and action for the resolution of public issues, whether in small, informal groups, organizational settings, or community contexts. Strengthening these abilities is the central focus of one of the national initiatives — building human capital. To make rural revitalization a reality, we must help to develop and maintain skilled community leadership. Moreover, our nation's economic productivity, international competitiveness, quality of life, and democratic form of government ultimately rest on the capabilities of our youth and adults to function effectively in the home, the community, and the work place (*Revitalizing Rural America*, p. 27).

In response to these challengs, CES and non-CES agencies and organizations are conducting increasingly more leadership development educational programs nationwide. These programs are widely diversified in content and range in scope from multi-state to statewide, multi-county, and even community specific. Some are single, short educational sessions, while others are multi-year programs. Audiences include both youth and adults as well as members of the general population and specific subgroups (e.g., Hispanics, farmers, or women). Program purposes also vary: from general leadership programming to community leadership development programming; from development of organizational leadership to development of volunteer workers.

These disparate program resources and efforts need to be commonly shared in order to magnify the impacts on rural communities in order to revitalize rural America. Community leadership programming — both CES and non-CES sponsored — is essential for building and developing human capital.

Task Force Background Activities

The task force has its roots in an interest network that was sponsored by the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development and that produced the 1984 publication, *Extension Community Leadership Programs in the United States*. The response to the publication, including the interest expressed by Extension personnel across the nation, encouraged network members and the North Central Regional Center to consider involving a national group to work on selected aspects of leadership programming and networking. Support from all of the regional centers made the task force a reality (*Community Leadership Development: Implications for Extension*, p. 1).

Task Force Membership

Task force members were selected under the auspices of all

four regional centers for rural development to represent the various regions of the country, all extension programming areas, and the 1890 institutions as well as the land-grant universities.

Members serving on the task force are: Lorna Michael Butler, Washington State University; Daryl Heasley, Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development, The Pennsylvania State University; Kenneth Hotopp, National Association of County Agricultural Agents, Cornell University; Peter F. Korsching, North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, Iowa State University; W. Robert Lovan, USDA/ES-NR & RD; Harriett Moyer, University of Wisconsin, Madison; Esther Shoup, Home Economics, University of Connecticut; Robert Soileau, Louisiana State University; John L. Tait, Iowa State University; Greg Tillson, Oregon State University; Ron Williams, ECOP/CRD-PA, Kentucky State University; John A. Michael, USDA/ES-PDEMS (ex-officio member). Serving as 1985 co-chairs of the task force were Lorna Michael Butler and Ron Williams. Co-chairs for 1986 were John Tait and Ron Williams. In 1987, co-chairs are Harriett Moyer and Ron Williams.

Purpose of This Publication

The purposes of this publication are to report the accomplishments of the ECOP/CRD-PA Subcommittee task force on Leadership Networking and participant networking activities since the Resurgence in Rural America: Mandate for Community Leadership conference, and to present its recommendations on future directions for community leadership development programming. The recommendations are presented in the context of a "white paper" rather than formal policy. Another important purpose is to help provide Extension and non-Extension professionals and lay-leaders with information that will help link current leadership programming issues, topics, trends, and examples of programming. This purpose is addressed by the following articles in publication:

- "Leadership Development: The Need and Response," by Bernie Ghiselin, Center for Creative Leadership.
- "Working with Our Publics: In-Service Education for Cooperative Extension," by Edgar J. Boone, North Carolina State University, Agricultural Extension Service.
- "Developing Leadership," By Lee J. Cary, Jack D. Timmons, Donald W. Littrell, and Tammy Klaproth, University of Missouri, Columbia.
- "Leadership Development and Public Policy Education: A Look at the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy," by John J. Kornacki, Resources for the Future.
- "Research-Practice Linkages in Community Leadership Development: Results of a National Study," by Frank A. Fear, Lela Vandenberg, and Manfred Thullen, Michigan State University.
- "Family Community Leadership," by Lois R. Bassett, Extension Homemaker, and James C. Barron, Washington State University.

Accomplishments and Recommendations of the Task Force

Accomplishments

The major charge of the task force was to create and maintain a national network for community leadership. To meet this charge, the task force needed to: identify appropriate Extension staff in all program areas, research staff, and non-Extension persons involved in community leadership programs; give leadership to establishing an ongoing system of sharing information on community leadership programs of interest to Cooperative Extension; and identify and recommend potential areas for program development and evaluation to state Extension services, regional community resource development committees, and the ECOP/CRD-PA Subcommittee. In addition, the task force deemed it desirable to seek out possible sources of private or public funding support for development of the network.

In the three years of the task force's existence, members attempted to meet the charge of the ECOP/CRD-PA Subcommittee by focusing their efforts on several major activities: (1) completing a national survey to determine the characteristics of Extension people who program in leadership development, (2) organizing a national conference to facilitate networking among these programmers and others interested in leadership development, and (3) publishing reports and proceedings designed to link Extension programmers to current research and teaching trends in leadership development.

To complete these activities, the task force organized itself into six subgroups: the Survey Work Group, the Networking Program Work Group, the Evaluation Work Group, the Networking Proceedings Work Group, the Networking Maintenance Work Group, and the Publications Work Group.

The national survey documenting the characteristics of Extension programmers in leadership development was reported upon in the Task Force's first publication, *Community Leadership Development: Implications for Extension*. This publication also featured a report on national initiatives in support of community leadership development programs and a review of leadership literature organized by the major theoretical approaches to the topic. Demand for this publication was great enough to warrant an initial printing of 2,000 copies and a second printing of 1,000 more.

The task force planned and held a national conference at Fort Mitchell, Kentucky, September 8-10, 1986. This conference was attended by more than 100 people from all regions of the United States and from Ontario, Canada. Conferees represented all programming areas in Extension, along with research faculty, government officials, and non-Extension organizations involved in community leadership development.

While planning the conference, a list of potential attendees and members of a national community leadership network was developed by contacting Extension directors in each state, as well as administrators of the 1890 schools.

A list of non-Extension organizations involved in leadership development was also developed, thus meeting objective one: "Establish mechanisms for identifying appropriate participants in a national Extension community leadership communications network."

The conference was designed to foster interaction and the formation of smaller interest groups among participants across all programming areas and states. Seven interest groups were formed at the conference, with a liaison from the task force assigned to each. The purpose in forming these groups was to stimulate a flow of information and action related to community leadership programming. These interest groups, or small networks, focused on community leadership research and development, resource development, program development, networking, marketing, evaluation, and programming for the hard-to-reach. The interest groups were formed to help meet the Task Force's second objective: "Develop methods for giving leadership to a system of information-sharing to support community leadership programs."

While details of this information-sharing system appear in the evaluation report which follows, a few examples here will illustrate just how well the system is working. The resource development interest group has held two meetings to work on a bibliography of Extension and research leadership materials, which will be distributed to the entire leadership network. The evaluation interest group is proposing to annotate and critique selections from the bibliography. The group dealing with programming for the hard-to-reach is developing materials for that audience. Various state networks have been formed to encourage the inclusion of community leadership development concepts and materials in all programming areas and across various policy education issues. Task force members contacted more than thirty people who attended the conference via a series of conference calls. Thus, the network was not only evaluated but also encouraged to maintain contact via phone calls. Both the conference and the evaluation of the resulting networking served to "Identify potential areas for needed program development and support," the third objective in the task force's plan of work.

Although the plan of work had a fourth objective, "Identify potential funding sources for network development," the other projects and efforts of the task force permitted little time for work on this objective. Since this objective was not met within the three-year existence of the task force, it should perhaps be the focus of another special group.

Following the conference, proceedings were sent to all participants. In the meantime, the networking maintenance work group produced a maintenance plan designed to strengthen and ensure the network's continuation after the three-year term of the task force. This plan included the production of news releases about the network and conference, submission of articles to national Extension publications, dissemination of names and addresses of conference attendees and interest group members to all networking participants, and a special six-month evaluation of the conference.

The publications work group produced this final publication of the task force to help meet its charge to "Recommend . . . potential areas for program development and evaluation." This publication is designed not only to set forth the accomplishments and recommendations of the task force, but also to give the network additional community leadership materials and highlight trends in leadership development, thus encouraging programming and further networking.

Evaluation of Conference and Networking

Methodology. To determine the status of networking in community leadership development programming, the task force decided to survey those conference attendees affiliated with the seven interest networks formed at the national conference.

In consultation with the task force, the evaluation committee developed a nine-page study plan, a two-page interview guide, and a cover letter explaining and requesting participation on the survey.

The interview guide consists of seven main questions about participants' past, present, and future activities in community leadership development. The guide also asks interviewees to assess the impact of the national conference on their work; to identify the support and resources needed; and to indicate the importance of working with non-Extension contacts in planning, conducting, and evaluating community leadership programs.

Copies of the interview guide and the cover letter were mailed to the more than fifty prospective interviewees and to all task force members. Task force members also received the study plan, which set forth procedures for interviewing and recording.

With USDA teleconference facilities, task force members conducted interviews with attendees. In all, five task force members contacted forty people in the interest networks; of these, thirty were interviewed and ten declined to participate. The most common grounds cited for nonparticipation were pressing exigencies of work or a feeling that a meaningful contribution could not be made because of inactivity in community leadership networking. The data gathered from the interviews are deemed broadly representative of all active network members.

The evaluation committee analyzed the interview transcripts and drafted the findings and recommendations of this report.

Findings.

1. Community Leadership Networking: Before the Conference — Respondents reported that networking efforts in community leadership prior to the national conference were mostly sporadic, narrow in program scope (i.e., a single discipline) and limited and narrow in contacts (e.g., with a single county or state).

Some informal networking in community leadership was reported to be occurring through state, regional, and national Extension committees and through attendance at

professional meetings such as the Community Development Society and Rural Sociological Society. Interviewees noted that specialized programs, such as Kellogg Family Community Leadership, have enhanced community leadership networking. Finally, responses indicate some community leadership networking with groups or organizations outside Extension, including churches, service clubs, and chambers of commerce.

2. Community Leadership Networking: Since the Conference — Community leadership networking efforts reported since the conference have increased at the individual and group levels. These efforts have tended to be more regular, interdisciplinary in scope, and broadened in contacts (both within and outside of Extension).

Individual level — respondents stated they had made new contacts, had shared resource materials, initiated contacts across program areas, learned about non-Extension resources, and were more aware of community leadership programs and personalities at and since the conference.

3. Interest Networking Groups — Of the seven interest network groups formed at the conference, five have developed action plans. The Resource Development interest network group members have met (under the sponsorship of the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development) and plan to gather and inventory a broad spectrum of community leadership materials regionally, nationally, and internationally. The Hard-to-Reach interest network group has developed a proposal asking ECOP to consider establishing a national committee. The Marketing interest network group has exchanged several items of mutual benefit. The Programming interest network group has begun a survey of its members to plan for the future. Members of the Networking interest group are planning a session for the annual meeting of the Kentucky volunteers. The Southern region, under the direction of Bo Beaulieu, met at the conference to begin networking across the region.

4. Major Constraints — Respondents reported the lack of organizational priorities, budget cuts, and time as the major constraints on becoming more actively involved in community leadership networking efforts. In addition, there was some confusion among participants at the national conference as to the definition of networking. Some defined networking as gathering information for one's own needs and possible use. Others regarded networking as an informal organization for a cooperative project or to help meet an on-going need. Continued and frequent contact with task force members has been helpful to most of the interest groups.

5. Anticipated Planned Community Leadership Networking — Respondents described several new plans for community leadership programming efforts in addition to those being undertaken by the various interest network groups. These networking activities would cross subject matter areas, organizational boundaries, and geographical/national boundaries. In most instances, efforts are expected to integrate community leadership across program lines; for example, Kansas is moving to develop one broad community leadership program to replace four. Personnel associated with the Northeast Rural Leadership program are developing a unified evaluation instrument that would gather comparable data from community leadership programs. Other states are interested in starting undergraduate and graduate courses in community leadership similar to the ones at Penn State. Extension-oriented respondents plan to initiate in-service education in community leadership for staff. The Family Community Leadership project was stimulated further by the national conference, and such programming is now being developed in every state.

6. If Community Leadership Networking Is to Be: Resources Needed — Sources and types: Respondents felt that if community leadership networking is to grow and succeed, ongoing resources to support networking activities will be necessary. Many respondents felt isolated and without support of community leadership networking. They reported a need for a formal organizational structure at the federal level and for various types of state support. Cited as crucial resources were the following:

(a) A lead organization and a national program leader (USDA-ES was mentioned most often in both categories.) Respondents felt such a leader should be well-grounded in leadership theory and practice and have widespread contacts within and outside Extension.

(b) A structure to maintain the activities already started (USDA-ES) or continuation of the present task force.

(c) The regional rural development centers.

(d) Legitimization by senior administrators at all levels of the organization.

In cases where such resources are forthcoming, the respondents were quick to report that community leadership ties into the eight national initiatives and can lead Extension to new audiences while strengthening ties with established audiences (e.g., local governmental officials, farm organizations, and so on).

Several ways of implementing community leadership networking were suggested. Numerous respondents felt national conferences or regional forums with similar cross-sectional audiences would be an excellent way to keep community leadership networking active. Most respondents viewed a quarterly newsletter on community leadership as a necessity; this possibility is currently being explored. Other resources suggested to help ensure community leadership networking include a computer data-base widely accessible to anyone interested, a discussion piece on networking, and a set of guidelines on networking.

Almost all respondents stated that if such resources are not forthcoming, current and planned efforts in community leadership networking will atrophy.

Recommendations

On the basis of the preceding data and on interactions with Extension professionals across the nation, the National Ex-

tension Task Force on Community Leadership makes the following recommendations for strengthening educational programming in community leadership in the Cooperative Extension System.

High Priority

1. Maintain A National Leadership Networking System for Professionals. Through the national conference and the follow-up work of interest networks which grew out of that forum, the task force has nurtured the establishment of a national networking system for community leadership. To continue and further develop this system, community leadership professionals must have national leadership for their networking activities at the local, state, and national levels.

A national networking system would provide leadership for: (a) sharing leadership educational materials (publications, slide/tape, video, etc.) and developing new materials, including those for networking; (b) conducting occasional national and regional conferences and forums between Extension and non-Extension professionals to disseminate new information and resource materials for community leadership programming; (c) developing a national newsletter on community leadership; and (d) enhancing the development of a national community leadership data base.

Through their existing systems, the regional rural development centers should continue to foster networking across states and regions by sponsoring applied research, publications, and in-service education, and by sharing educational materials through the regional newsletters. Conference participants have also indicated that they need appropriate ways, such as a national newsletter to share community leadership information and resources. Networking can help make the most effective use of limited resources in community leadership educational programming.

2. Strengthen and Support the National Program Leader Position for Community Leadership. A national program leader with professional skills and competencies in both theoretical and practical leadership should continue to give direction to community leadership within the federal Extension system. National leadership is the key to accomplishing the new national initiatives. Community leadership subject matter should be integrated into the content of the new national program initiatives; it will provide an essential link in networking across Extension program areas. Other major tasks for a national program leader include: (a) linking research, Extension, and resident instruction in the best tradition of land-grant institutions; (b) networking with other public and private community leadership providers; (c) linking county, state, and federal levels through the sharing of community leadership information and resource materials; and (d) giving leadership in Extension for future directions in community leadership programs.

3. Encourage and Support Basic and Applied Research on Community Leadership. Data and information generated from both basic and applied research is critical for the development of effective educational programs in community leadership. With limited resources for community leadership research, Extension personnel need to cooperate with researchers and resident instructors in the land-grant system and with the regional rural development centers to initiate, encourage, and seek funds for basic and applied research. The declining population and outmigration of youth and young potential leaders from many rural communities is contributing to a leadership crisis. More basic and applied research in community leadership is essential.

4. Develop Leadership Programs to Complement Educational Programs Conducted for Community Leaders, Particularly in Rural Areas. Educational programs conducted for community leaders often include technical information, an essential ingredient for community decision-making, but they often fail to include subject matter on leadership and public involvement in the decision-making process. Community leadership should be integrated into all relevant programs and activities, such as the formulation of public policies affecting the use of chemical fertilizers in agriculture, analysis of the local situation in determining future directions for rural economic development, development of human capital through youth programs, and provision of human services for the elderly.

Leadership and public involvement are important in formulating effective public policies that affect the lives of all community members. Since rural areas have fewer paid professionals and are more dependent on community volunteer leadership, community leadership educational programs are needed for revitalizing rural America.

5. Provide Senior Administrative Support for Community Leadership Programming. Deans, state Extension directors, state program leaders, state experiment station directors, and resident instruction administrators need to make decisions that will give higher priority and more program direction to community leadership. Community leadership development programs are essential to the mission of the land-grant universities and colleges and to their extension services. In order to fulfill the recommendations in this report, senior administrative leadership is critical.

Priority

1. Develop In-Service Education on Community Leadership for Extension Professionals. The "Resurgence in Rural America: Mandate for Community Leadership" Conference gave Extension staff a valuable in-service education opportunity to share community leadership information and network with both Extension and private program providers. Extension professionals need in-service educational programs in community leadership on identifying community leadership needs, establishing goals, planning and designing educational programs, selecting program delivery methods, and evaluating program impacts at all levels — county, state, region, and nation. Professional Extension workers should become models and mentors of leadership as well as effective teachers of leadership. In-service education in community leadership can do much to strengthen the skills and capabilities of Extension staff to be effective professional educators.

2. Encourage Networking with Non-Extension Groups and Organizations. In order to fulfill the missions of the land-grant colleges and universities, professionals at these institutions must network with non-Extension public and private providers of community leadership programs at all levels — county, state, region, and nation — and share leadership information. Cooperative programs may be appropriate in some instances. Extension's community leadership program should complement other programs and help to fill the gaps where critical programming needs exist.

Community Leadership Trends, Topics, and Programming

Providing professionals and lay leaders with information that will help link current leadership programming issues, topics, and trends is a major purpose of this publication. The following five articles are offered to help Extension professionals remain current in the field of community leadership programming.

Bernie Ghiselin's article offers insights into why leadership is important to the current American economic situation. The author presents a list of techniques currently used to teach executives leadership principles, and he notes the topics most in demand by business executives.

Edgar Boone gives the details of a national Extension in-service training project, "Working with Our Publics: In-Service Education for Cooperative Extension." One of the modules in this project is devoted to leadership. The definitions and major assumptions of this module are given in "Developing Leadership" by Lee Cary, Jack Timmons, Donald Littrell, and Tammy Klaproth.

John Kornacki writes about the formation of the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy, a unit of the Washington, D.C. based Resources for the Future. His article details the leadership programming of this nonprofit research organization.

Results of a national study on research practice linkages in community leadership development are presented in the Frank Fear et al. article. Recommendations on community leadership programming and research are presented.

Facts about the national Family Community Leadership program are cited in the Bassett and Barron article.

Leadership Development: The Need and Response

By Bernie Ghiselin, Assistant Editor, Center for Creative Leadership, Greensboro, North Carolina

The Context

There is no hiding place any more. The questions, the harsh realities are all there, on page one, in plain view.

It is but a short leap from the challenges reported in the press to the needs of managers and executives to reassess their roles, their development, their ability to lead.

"Can America compete?" asks the April issue of *Business Week*, bemoaning sagging productivity and slow growth. "At the beginning of this decade, the problem was clear," reports a General Motors ad. "American industry was in decline." Its response, said GM, was to develop "a new American method of production, integrating new technology with new social systems in human partnership that gives people authority for their work."

Dr. John Brademas, president of New York University, in a June, 1987, article on American competitiveness, writes: "There is more than enough evidence that the engine of the American economy may be running out of steam." Among his suggestions: "Tougher educational standards and more effective training/retraining programs. . . ."

In many respects, the plights described by *Business Week*, General Motors, and Dr. Brademas describe the context for changes in management or the private sector.

The watchwords and imperatives of the 1980s that filter through articles on management are by now familiar. Competition. Flexibility. Human Partnership. Service. Organizational culture. Productivity. Innovation.

How did things get this way? And what does this mean for the rising executive who worries about career obsolescence? First, a look at a few economic changes affecting executive development.

One of the more dramatic economic changes of the 1980s has been the nearly worldwide spread of the idea that market forces and aggressive capitalism are engines for progress. Along with the growth of international financial markets, this change has led to a global economy that has redefined the nature of competition. Countries from Korea to Brazil are becoming industrial powers and are rewriting the rules.

An established U.S. company that has enjoyed a competitive edge in, say, lawn mowers, suddenly finds new competition. Not only this, the company finds its customers are changing. They want different kinds of yard care and gardening equipment. The company must now redefine its business, form a new vision, set different goals. The world is moving. Is the company simply in the grass cutting business? Or must the company now place itself in a wider context: gardening, yard care, or even landscaping?

In this global economy of aggressive new competition, the life cycles of products, whether lawn mowers or microcomputers, are much shorter. A company can no longer be content to only be efficient; it must be creative. The competition is moving. Companies must work harder to foster an environment where innovation and new ideas flourish. To a great extent, like General Motors, they must fundamentally restructure, bringing massive upheaval to managers who believed they were climbing stable ladders to the top. Suddenly, ladders are falling.

In addition, managers must change their orientation to the customer. Over the last decade, America has been changing from a predominantly industrial economy to a service-oriented one. *Fortune* (February 1987) has predicted that between now and the end of the 1980s, nine of every ten new jobs in the United States will be in service industries like computing, banking, food service, travel, and the information services.

As a result, managers are learning what it means to be "customer driven" rather than "product driven." Scandinavian Airlines is often cited. After a change in its marketing philosophy, SAS went from an $8 million loss in 1981 to a $71 million profit in less than a year.

SAS achieved this turnaround by working much harder to cater to its regular customers, the business travelers. SAS changed from an inward, production-oriented airline to one that is customer driven and service oriented. SAS defined itself not as a company simply flying planes from one city to another, but as an airline concerned about a broad spectrum of the customer's travel needs, whether food, hotel reservations, limousine service, or baggage service.

Like SAS, many companies, many sectors of the economy, are facing changes in fundamental strategic direction. Who are we? What business are we in? This has produced a rediscovery of corporate culture; top management cannot make fundamental strategic change apart from the values, the ideology that exists today. SAS could not change its mission without first changing traditional attitudes and values.

No manager, no top executive, no administrator, no section of government or industry is immune from the questions faced in 1979 by Scandinavian Airlines. What is our mission? Our vision of the future? As funding changes, as the customer changes, as tax laws, technology, and competition change, the same questions apply. Whether it's the Department of Agriculture, a midwestern university, or a company that makes lawn mowers. What does the customer want? How do we keep a competitive edge?

Organizational structure itself is changing. In this world of rugged competition, short product cycles, and greater flexibility, classical hierarchial organizations with large functional operations — huge accounting or design departments — are being found cumbersome. As a result, middle management is often becoming obsolete.

The trend today is toward small teams, flat organizational structures of limited hierarchy where key decisions are made at the front line, not in some distant corporate office.

"Decisions must be made at the interface where it makes

sense," said Robert Swiggett, chairman of Kollmorgen, Inc., in a recent colloquium.

"When you get big you lose trust, you lose informality, you build up elaborate control systems," he added. "You build empires which have to be protected. You lose desire and vigor because the company gets kind of fat and successful. You lose the perceived necessity to bet the company on a new idea."

With these words, Swiggett touches upon an entire new set of watchwords being heard in management theory. Culture of trust. Teamwork. Self-actualization. Greater staff responsibility.

Managers of the 1990s will realize that workers are better educated and have different expectations than in, say, the 50s. No longer are money and promotions enough. Today's worker questions management more freely, is likely to give family and personal growth as great a priority as career. He or she may demonstrate more loyalty to personal goals and inner rewards than to corporate objectives.

In view of these trends and changes, both in the economy and in society, the context for management development and training is much larger.

Top managers must be generalists. They must broaden their understanding of their ogranizations; they must broaden their view of themselves as people and leaders; they must broaden their view of those they manage and lead.

To manage change, to manage crisis, to meet sudden competition, to do more with shrinking resources, managers will rely less on regulation and protectionism and more on creativity. Today, innovation is as great a watchword as efficiency and productivity.

Executive development, then, is less an orientation to specific skills than a holistic view of the person. There is a growing understanding that a manager's entire repertoire of behaviors shapes performance and potential; family life, personality and cognitive styles as well as knowledge of the business.

In general, the context for training today is one that places a greater emphasis on leadership development than on traditional management training. While both are concerned with developing people, the manager is more focused on means, a fixer, one who keeps things in kilter.

While the manager's role is primarily transactual, the leader's is transformational. The leader sets the overall environment, forms and shares the vision, the mission, the goals. He or she does not become enthralled with this function or that, with technical minutiae.

"The great enemy (of leadership) is specialization," said John Gardner, founder of Common Cause, in a 1986 interview. A former president of the Carnegie Corporation and former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Dr. Gardner is writing a series of papers on leadership for *Independent Sector*.

"The onward march of large-scale, complex organizations continues and if you talk to CEOs today," he said, "you will find them almost unanimously wanting leadership. . . .

"A lot of their concern . . . is that these very large, very complex organizations over which they preside are so extraordinarily unfitted to cope with the turmoil of the modern world.

"Here's a world . . . of tumult, a world of systems colliding and everything changing. And what is the instrument that they have to deal with that turmoil? It is a rather monolithic, conventional bureaucracy inhabited by managers who really are rather entranced with the complexities of the organization and keeping it going in all its complex ways.

"And so specialization and large-scale complex organizations are the two enemies of leadership. And they've been growing steadily."

While the manager may require a specialization, the leader cannot afford the luxury. The leader finds good managers, empowers them with responsibility, and lets them make the decisions. If the overall mission and goals are intact, the leader can tolerate individual lapses of performance.

The illusion that good old American know-how can save an organization or a culture is disappearing. If people want more than just lawn mowers, then building a more mechanically efficient lawn mower with sharper blades is not going to save the company.

Cultural change in America is universal. It's universities facing a dwindling supply of eighteen-year-olds, hospitals competing with other hospitals, farmers realizing farming is not enough.

The task of leadership is not to fight change with every new educational, medical, or agricultural technology, but to place that university, that hospital, that farm into a context that is flexible, consistent with intrinsic virtues, and engaged in new missions.

The vision and the talent to make these changes in organizational culture is the task of a leader who can see beyond the functional, the technical, the narrow specialities.

"I think a profound thing is going on in America," says Warren Bennis, Distinguished Professor of Business Administration at the University of California. "Until the mid 1970s, America's industrial might was predicated on technology, which really didn't have to have good leadership to be successful.

"Since about the mid-1970s, however, we have been threatened by other countries, by all sorts of global competition. And people perceive that leadership seems to be the missing key. Since Reagan came to office there has been a belief that leadership is the most decisive factor in organizational success."

Design and Methodology

Fortunately, the field of training and development enjoys a favorable climate: Managers believe in self-development, self-change, and they believe that training will help them. Their attitude is truly pragmatic: if they work hard enough, they can solve problems and make changes.

How, then, does training help managers in developing leadership potential? How do they learn strategic management? What experiences will help them to foster a spirit of

creativity and innovation in their organizations? The lessons they seek are more about themselves as people than they are traditional academic instruction. What are their leadership styles? Their decision and problem-solving styles? How are they perceived by subordinates and peers? Are they good team players? Do they communicate clearly, give useful feedback?

While managers want training supported by research, they are not interested in the purely theoretical. They want to know what they can put to work now. To meet these pragmatic needs, management development programs pay close attention to the way adults learn, grow, and change.

By and large, adults are energized to learn because they have an immediate problem, some need or interest that learning will satisfy. This problem or need is the appropriate starting point for training. The core of methodology of adult education is the analysis of experience.

Furthermore, the adult orientation to learning is life-centered. The appropriate exercises, then, are life situations, not academic subjects. Adults have a deep need to be self-directing. The role of the teacher or trainer is to engage in a process of mutual inquiry and the mutual discovery of knowledge.

Finally, individual differences among people increase with age. Therefore, adult education must make optimal provision for differences in style, time, place, and the need and the pace of learning.

Today, there is increasing recognition that training begins, and resumes, after the classroom experience, in the workplace. A growing body of literature shows that work experience and formal training need to relate, to be well integrated. The development of top-level executives implies an appropriate combination of the two.

For companies paying attention to this integration, the training process begins at home with an evaluation of mutual needs, both the manager's and the organization's. Following this assessment, the manager enrolls in a program tailored for his organization and his particular needs.

Upon completion of the program, the manager returns for a debriefing, summarizes the training experience, and sets new goals for change. In this manner, training is transferable, relevant both to the home environment and the individual manager.

The training method that accommodates these design considerations and moves with the challenges of the '80s is the experiential. It focuses on the observable, the measurable. What are managers actually doing, in contrast to what they say?

This method gives both trainers and managers the basis for analysis that leads to goals and change. It gives managers a close view of themselves in terms of concrete action. It gives trainers the knowledge they need to give the individual manager that new understanding.

Among the more widely used experiential techniques are simulations, case studies, role-playing, and feedback from psychological instruments, superiors, peers, and subordinates.

To cite a few examples:

• **Behavioral simulations.** The more effective simulations are realistic. They recreate the organizational environment of the '80s; one of risk, ambiguity, and intense competition. Participants "manage" the organization during a normal workday. It is a day of distraction, red herrings, and complexity, a day for difficult decisions. Participants must form goals and strategy as they go along.

The pace, the tension, the interactions with others combine to bring out natural behavior. All this is being observed by professional trainers. Once the simulation ends, the participants examine their actions, their decisions. From this feedback, they can discover their strengths and blind spots, see themselves as they would not in their ordinary home environment.

• **Role-playing and case studies** put managers in a position where they develop their own insights, discover their own individual truths. How they behave. Why. How others perceive that behavior.

• **Psychological instruments.** Leadership development programs give managers a comprehensive picture of their decision and leadership styles, their strengths and blind spots. The principal method of assessment is the information gathered from various questionnaires and psychological instruments. A battery of tests can give a manager the rounded view of his virtues, his impact on others, his view of the world that he may derive from no other source.

Of course, there are many instruments. Some measure cognitive skills; others show interpersonal styles. Each has its place.

To cite just one, the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator enjoys wide favor. A self-report inventory based on Jung's theory of types, the Myers-Briggs is designed to measure personality dispositions and interests on four dimensions: extroversion/introversion, sensing/intuition, thinking/feeling, and judging/perceiving.

The Myers-Briggs gives a healthy respect for individual differences, particularly how people process information and reach decisions on that information. A strongly extroverted person will approach a problem in a manner very different from that of a strong introvert. For the manager's understanding of leadership styles, the insights of the Myers-Briggs can be valuable.

In summary, executive development in the 1990s will heed adult styles of learning, will be transferable, and integrated rather than detached from specific personal and organizational needs. And, finally, developmental programs will remain behavioral, focusing on the observable and measurable.

How, then, can this style of training accommodate managers facing the economic and managerial challenges of the '80s? What are the hot topics of today? And how does experiential training address them?

Hot Topics

Most assuredly, managers today must do the same thing that managers did thirty years ago: manage people and manage tasks in some combination. But their approaches

are changing and they are not making traditional demands on training.

Managers want to know more about leadership instead of traditional management skills. They are being told to learn more about strategic management, to become more flexible, to become generalists and stop hiding behind specialization, to listen more closely to the customer.

In research and development, managers feel a greater urgency to understand and cope with the many obstacles that block innovative new ideas from maturing into marketable products.

Within top management, more senior executives are seeking developmental experiences that fit those who have reached the top, but they do not want to stop learning and growing.

A few examples:

• **Leadership development.** Leaders are in the people business; if they aren't furthering the development of others, they should get out. But managers first need to understand their own developmental needs. Today, they are flocking to leadership development programs to receive the assessment and feedback needed to understand their own leadership and decision-making styles and form their own programs for change.

Leadership development programs are effective when integrated with home organization programs and if managers receive this developmental assessment at a critical point in their careers.

• **Strategic management.** Quite often, senior managers spend so much time putting out brush fires that they lose sight of overall objectives and goals. In their career counseling, these managers are being told, "Learn to think and act strategically, or you're in trouble."

Strategic management is many things. To a great extent, it is the art of denial, deciding what not to do. In general, it is the simultaneous juggling of three questions: What do we want? What do the customers want? And what can we do?

As technology and business climate changes, as new competition appears, strategic management is the re-forming of vision and goals, doing things necessary to ratchet a business one more notch toward its goals.

Rather than simply put senior managers in classrooms with lectures and films, experiential training can put them on the line. Put them in realistic simulations where they can see their own strategic faults in the glaring light of day, but in a risk-free environment. Through discovery learning and tests, they can develop a view of their biases and come away with goals and an agenda for better strategic management.

• **Structuring for innovation.** It has long become apparent that the reason organizations lack innovation, the reason creative ideas fail, is that organizations are structured only to follow tradition. Few organizations encourage change or nurture the creative.

Today, however, products do not enjoy long life cycles, competition is moving, technology is moving, deregulation is changing the business climate. Suddenly, more resources are needed in research and development. But does the R&D climate permit the risky new idea to develop?

Increasingly, organizations are searching for better ways to foster creativity and innovation. They need better communications among the various functions, R&D, marketing, finance. They need better teamwork, brainstorming, a broader perception of problem-solving options.

Again, experiential training has shown it can recreate the back-home environment, full of the same stress and risk, where managers can examine their own obstacles to cretivity and come away with a better understanding of their own styles of innovation.

• **Creation of organizational values.** In recent years, organizations have rediscovered their very culture and climate. Their strategy changes have not been supported by the way the business was organized and operated. Departures from custom and tradition can be resisted.

To a great extent, the answer to this dilemma is better information, better data, a sound research base for change.

But the answer also lies in transmitting the values implicit in the new strategy into the organizational culture.

In recent years, research has gained a better understanding of the importance of organizational values and how they impinge on leadership and strategy.

Somewhat like water to fish, values permeate every managerial action, from an offhand comment to a major policy announcement. Effective leaders are aware of the values implicit in their actions and use these values to lead by example.

Through focused exercise, training programs are beginning to assist managers in the subtle integration of organization and strategy through an understanding of these values.

Other topics could be described, but most would be elaborations on the above. For example, there are leadership development programs for individual audiences, such as executive women. And there are programs in creativity that are crafted to the needs of individual companies.

In summary, management development consists of a balance: the right jobs, the right training, the right people.

If the organization is not willing to invest in leadership training, it leaves development only to the lessons of job experiences and the school of hard knocks.

These lessons may be haphazard; they may be the wrong lessons. Even if they are the best possible experiences, the manager still needs an overall context in order to understand and plan the next state of executive and leadership development.

Dr. Ronald Nelson, Director of the Education and Nonprofit Sector Applications Group, the Center for Creative Leadership, assisted in planning and editing this article.

References

BARNES, ZANE E. "Change in the Bell System." *The Academy of Management Executive*, February 1987, pp. 43-46.

BENNIS, W., and B. NANUS. *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. Harper and Row, 1985.

BLANCHARD K., and S. JOHNSON. *The One Minute Manager*. Morrow, 1982.

FOSTER, R. *Innovation: The Attacker's Advantage*. Summit Books, 1986.

HYMOWITZ, CAROL. "Stable Cycles of Executive Careers Shattered by Upheaval in Business." *The Wall Street Journal*, May 26, 1987, p. 35.

KOLB, DAVID A. *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Prentice-Hall, 1984.

KNOWLES, MALCOLM. *The Adult Learner: A Neglected Species*. Gulf Publishing, 1984.

MCGREGOR, DOUGLAS. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. McGraw-Hill, 1960.

NULTY, PETER. "How Managers Will Manage." *Fortune*, February 2, 1987, pp. 47-50.

PETERS, T., and R. WATERMAN. *In Search of Excellence*. Harper & Row, 1982.

SAYLES, L. *Leadership: What Effective Managers Really Do and How They Do It*. McGraw-Hill, 1979.

SINETAR, MARSHA. "The Actualized Worker." *The Futurist*, March-April, 1987, pp. 21-25.

Working with Our Publics: In-Service Education for Cooperative Extension Overview of the Project

By Edgar J. Boone, Project Director, North Carolina State University, Agricultural Extension Service

"Working with Our Publics: In-Service Education for Cooperative Extension" consists of eight training modules that will be made available to all state and territorial Cooperative Extension Services in the spring of 1988. The modules are intended to increase the ability and effectiveness of all professional Extension educators in effecting planned change among Extension clientele. They are designed both to stand alone, as individual modules, and to comprise a coordinated series.

The development of these modules comes at a time of much soul-searching regarding the current role and future prospects for this uniquely American institution. It comes at a time when emphasis is being placed upon the necessity for increasingly higher levels of technical competence among Extension personnel; when the academic programs in which these professionals receive their undergraduate and graduate education are focusing more and more on technical specialization; when social, economic, and other conditions affecting individuals, families, and communities are changing at an accelerating pace; when the complexity of their work situations demands that Extension professionals possess an increasingly more comprehensive understanding of the evolving milieu in which Extension programs must exist and with which professionals must deal.

It has been judged that there are generic competencies that all Extension professionals must possess, and that the national pool of talent among Extension educators should be marshaled to design in-service training that will enable Extension professionals to acquire those competencies.

What Is This Project?

"Working with our Publics" grew directly from needs expressed by both Extension agents and subject-matter specialists as the Cooperative Extension System turned from an emphasis on specific discipline-oriented programs to include those of a multidisciplinary nature.

Multidisciplinary programs were becoming necessary to focus on such issues as (1) competitiveness and profitability of agriculture; (2) alternative agricultural opportunities; (3) water quality; (4) conservation and management of natural resources; (5) revitalization of rural America; (6) increasing family economic and emotional stability; (7) improving nutrition, diet, and health; and (8) building and developing human capital.

These issue-oriented programs have social, political, psychological, and economic implications. Further, in planning, designing, and implementing issue-oriented programs, Extension professionals found themselves becoming involved in and working with other groups and organizations that also had a stake in resolving many of these issues. Collaborating and networking with these groups and organizations became essential to Extension professionals in planning and implementing programs that would produce significant results.

With these changes in their approach to Extension work, Extension professionals quickly discovered that their roles as change agents must encompass both an understanding of and skills in the extension education process, as well as mastery of technical subject matter. Although highly specialized in their technical subject matter areas, many of these Extension professionals had little or no preparation in the extension education process. While comfortable with traditional commodity or subject-matter-oriented programs, many were unsure about how to develop and coordinate programs focused on multidisciplinary issues.

This growing need to learn how to more effectively involve people in planning, implementing, and evaluating multidisciplinary programs, first expressed in 1978, was refined through a 1981 national assessment conducted by Paul Gessaman and Ronald Powers, which led to a proposal the following year for a broad-based, in-service education program in community and rural development (CRD). In response, ES/USDA approved and funded a special needs project to consider the suggested training, for which a sixteen member design team was established. In 1984, the team presented its curriculum to Extension Administrator Mary Nell Greenwood, several state Extension directors, and ECOP for their study, evaluation, and recommendations. These reviewers recommended that the scope and design of the proposed curriculum be modified to change its emphasis on CRD to encompass the total extension education process.

The resulting report was given careful review by ECOP's Personnel and Program Development Subcommittee, whose chairman, Randall Barnett, appointed a task force to explore further development. Edgar J. Boone, North Carolina State University at Raleigh, was selected to lead this task force, which subsequently revised the proposed curriculum to focus on the total extension education process and recommended seeking funding to support the development of eight training modules. Under the leadership of North Carolina State University and with the approval of ECOP, a proposal for funding the eight training modules was submitted to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The Kellogg Foundation endorsed the project, and in August 1985, "Working with our Publics" was officially underway. With a total of $1.4 million in Kellogg support and under the direction of Edgar J. Boone, the project is scheduled for completion in July 1988.

What Are These Training Modules?

The eight training modules that comprise "Working with Our Publics" represent a total of 114 contact hours of in-service education based on the skills and knowledge required of Extension professionals to work cooperatively

with one another, and with their clientele, as educators in facilitating solutions to those critical issues confronting American society that fall within Extension's mission. The objectives of these modules were developed through survey, analysis, and discussion with Extension practitioners. Very briefly, these modules are as follows:

Module 1: Understanding the Land-Grant University and Its Mission in Contemporary Society. The origin, philosophy, objectives, and contemporary nature of the land-grant institutions and their missions, as authorized by federal legislation known as the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890. Extension professionals who complete this module will acquire an understanding and appreciation of the unique role of the land-grant institution in the development of American society. Particular attention will be focused on (1) the setting and events leading up to the passage of the legislation that established the land-grant system; (2) the early beginnings of land-grant systems; (3) factors that shaped the development and maturation of the land-grant system during the past century; (4) the addition of the research (1887) and extension (1914) functions to the teaching function; and (5) challenges facing the land-grant system as it moves into the twenty-first century. New and experienced Extension staff members will be given the opportunity to understand the land-grant institution's tripartite functions (i.e., teaching, research, and extension) and its structure, as well as the unique role of the land-grant institution in American education. (Twelve contact hours of training developed by G.L. Carter and George Hyatt, North Carolina State University at Raleigh.)

Module 2: Understanding Cooperative Extension. The history, mission, values, and networks that make the Cooperative Extension System and the land-grant institutions unique. Participants will examine their own expectations, values, and skills in light of the System's needs to ensure a good "fit" between the individual and the institution. (Six contact hours of training developed by David Sanderson, University of Maine at Orono.)

Module 3: The Extension Education Process. An introduction to and guided practice in the principles, concepts, and processes of nonformal Extension education — planning, designing and implementing, and evaluating and accounting for Extension programs. Both new and experienced staff who complete this module will understand and be able to apply the programming process as it related to extension education. (Twenty-four contact hours of training developed by Richard T. Liles and R. David Mustian at North Carolina State University at Raleigh.)

Module 4: Developing Leadership. How to gain and exercise leadership skills and identify, recruit, develop, and work with volunteer leaders. Intended for all Extension personnel, this module is designed to improve participants' abilities to identify and involve lay leaders in Extension programs and hence to develop leadership capabilities among Extension clientele. (Twelve contact hours of training developed by Lee J. Cary, University of Missouri at Columbia).

Module 5: Situational Analysis. How to determine the need for the Extension educator's involvement through understanding the economic, social, political, and environmental context in planning, designing, and implementing programs. This module is designed to provide both new and experienced Extension staff with an appreciation of the role of analysis in programming and decision making, as well as with the skills to identify, collect, analyze, and use relevant data in the extension education effort. (Twelve contact hours of training developed by Laverne Forest, University of Wisconsin at Madison.)

Module 6: Working with Groups and Organizations. Development of skills in working with and through groups and understanding the behavior of groups, organizations, and agencies. New and experienced staff who complete this training will be better able to analyze the behavior of individuals, groups, organizations, and governmental agencies. They will gain the skills to build mutually beneficial working relationships and to work with networks of influence and key power actors in client communities. (Eighteen contact hours of training developed by Betty Wells, Iowa State University.)

Module 7: Education for Public Decisions. In-service education in analyzing public problems, anticipating the consequences of Extension's involvement in issues, and working effectively in areas of public controversy. Personnel who play a part in deciding Extension's involvement will build the knowledge and skills needed to design, deliver, and evaluate educational programs on public issues. (Eighteen contact hours developed by Verne W. House, Montana State University, and Ardis A. Young, Washington State University.

Module 8: Analytic Techniques for Future Programming. Information and exercises on working with Extension's publics to achieve a proactive stance toward the future through projecting future conditions, analyzing trends, and inventing futures. All participants, particularly those with a background of field experience, will benefit from enhanced capabilities to develop and provide educational programming that helps clients carry out systematic planning for the future. (Twelve contact hours of training developed by J. David Deshler, Cornell University.)

What Will These Materials Look Like?

Each of the eight modules is being developed as an independent package that contains several components: an authoritative yet readable source book of the subject matter, including an annotated bibliography for reference purposes, detailed instructions for the training leader, materials for training participants, and supporting audiovisual aids. Depending upon the module, the materials will include, in addition to printed media, overhead transparencies, slides, videotapes, audiotapes, posters, and programs for computer exercises.

"Working With Our Publics" is intended to provide the trainer with self-contained training packages developed by recognized leaders in the field and produced in a more pol-

ished form than individual states could afford. Each state and territorial Cooperative Extension Service will receive several complete copies of all printed materials, a complete set of nonprint audiovisuals, and "starter sets" of consumables for learners. The project also will provide masters from which these Extension Services can reproduce additional sets of the learner materials, or will have these materials available for purchase at cost.

Train-the-trainer workshops are planned for late spring of 1988. The purpose of these workshops will be to provide representatives from each state and territorial Extension Service with an overview of the project's goals and objectives and with intensive training in how to use and teach the eight modules.

What Has Been Involved in This Project?

Since the days of its inception, the project has reflected broad-based involvement at all levels of the Cooperative Extension System. This involvement continues, at the broadest level, through financial support and active participation of the leadership of the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, national Extension involvement through direct ES-USDA staff support, and ongoing guidance from ECOP, P&PD, and an ECOP-appointed Project Task Force. The land-grant institution based authors of the eight training modules represent eight state Extension Services. Many other state-level and county-level Extension educators are contributing their expertise as reviewers, editors, and field-test judges of the training materials. Involvement will intensify the spring of 1988, when all state and territorial Cooperative Extension Services participate formally in the train-the-trainer workshops.

What Are the Benefits to Extension?

Those who have planned, supported, and developed this in-service education program, "Working with Our Publics," believe it has the potential to revitalize the Cooperative Extension System. The eight modules represent well-designed, professionally produced training materials that should be a welcome resource to anyone with the responsibility for in-service education for both beginning and experienced Extension professionals. If implemented effectively, several benefits should accrue to state and territorial Extension Services:

First. Extension staff members will acquire a better understanding and appreciation of their land-grant institution, its struggles, and its unique role in American education. Learners will grasp the connection between Extension as it is practiced at their land-grant institution and the grassroots level of their everyday work. This module states explicitly the contribution of the land-grant system to Extension's heritage and philosophy.

Second. Extension professionals will have a better understanding of and deeper appreciation for their roots. Their increased understanding of the rich cultural heritage of Cooperative Extension work should result in a deeper commitment to Extension's mission, philosophy, and objectives. Further, these Extension staff members will develop a better grasp of the unique role of state and territorial Extension Services in extending the knowledge base and research findings of their respective land-grant institutions to the public. Of special note are the in-depth philosophical values that Extension professionals will acquire to guide them in their everyday work in a complex and changing economic, social, and political and environment.

Third. Extension professionals will acquire a conceptually based and systematic approach to Extension work, whether the context be farm, rural, urban, or a combination of these environments. This approach to extension education focuses on those concepts, values, and skills proven to be cost-effective and efficient in planning, designing and implementing, and evaluating and accounting for dynamic programs of change among the publics being served. Extension professionals will greatly enhance their effectiveness in focusing on, giving priority to, and targeting publics to be served. Further, the impact and cost-effectiveness of Extension professionals' programmatic efforts will be increased through a field-tested and proven approach to planning, designing, and implementing, and evaluating and accounting for planned educational programs.

Fourth. Extension professionals will improve their effectiveness in identifying, recruiting, developing, and using volunteer leaders in planning, designing, and implementing Extension programs. This increased effectiveness will enhance their ability to serve more people through their programmatic efforts.

Fifth. Extension professionals will learn how to collect, analyze, and interpret data as a basis for identifying both the felt and analyzed needs of their publics. Further, they will acquire self-diagnostic tools that should enable them to determine and cope with personal values that affect their decisions on what data to collect and how to analyze and interpret it.

Sixth. New and experienced Extension professionals will gain increased understanding of how to form and use groups in planning and implementing programs. They also will acquire conceptual tools that should enable them to analyze the behavior of individuals, groups, organizations, and governmental agencies and thus increase their effectiveness in working with these clients. They will gain the skills needed to build mutually beneficial working relationships with networks of influence and key power actors in client communities.

Seventh. Extension professionals will enhance their abilities and skills in working with people to help them understand and resolve public problems and issues through purposive involvement in informal decision making in carefully designed public forums. Of equal importance is the sense of security that Extension professionals will attain in dealing with public policy issues in an education context.

Eighth. Extension professionals will become more adept in planning for and forecasting the future state of affairs in their work environment. This acquisition of a proactive

stance in programming will enable them to program for the future as well as the present.

To summarize, mastery of the eight modules will bring about fundamental changes in the Cooperative Extension System — from specific, discipline-oriented programs to an integrated, coordinated attack on crucial issues that have social, political, and psychological as well as economic implications for the people they serve, and from technical expertise alone to the added facet of extension education. These added concepts, values, and skills will not become realities without corresponding changes in the abilities of the men and women who form the Cooperative Extension System. "Working with Our Publics" is the link that will connect a dream to the world of actualities.

Developing Leadership

By Lee J. Cary, Jack D. Timmons, Donald W. Littrell, and Tammy Klaproth, Members of the Project Team, Department of Community Development, University of Missouri, Columbia

Developing leadership is the subject matter of the fourth module in the "Working with Our Publics" project described in Edgar Boone's preceding article. The following is the introduction to the source book for this module. It sets forth the assumptions and definitions upon which the module is based.

Introduction to Leadership Module

Leadership is a shared function rather than belonging to one individual. This module is focused on the knowledge, functions, and skills of leadership as a process. When this process is being carried out by an individual, we identify that person as a leader. As others in the group or organization help carry out this process, they share the leadership and, for that period of time, become leaders.

Leadership knowledge and skills are broadly applicable and can be learned. Having said this, it is important to recognize that leadership is situational. That is, the application of leadership knowledge and skills must relate to the context and content of a specific situation. The context can be a small group, organization, or community, always situated within a particular environment and related to the larger context. The specific issue content is whatever the group, organization, or community identifies as its concern or focus. Remember, too, that these leaders usually are volunteers. They are giving their time and energies for a variety of personal and social reasons, and have elected, appointed, or have assumed leadership positions within the group or organization.

The materials in this module are designed to help Extension educators and the people they work with become increasingly effective in dealing with a wide variety of issues, concerns, problems, and challenges of leadership. The focus of this module is on leadership values, knowledge, and skills, with the emphasis on "how-to." The objectives are to make Extension professionals more aware of leadership opportunities, to sharpen the Extension staff's skills in identifying current and potential leaders and involving them in a leadership development process, and to increase the shared responsibility for designing and implementing educational programs that will help to develop and strengthen the leadership capabilities of the people with whom we work.

Leadership is defined in four ways in this module:

1. Community leadership. The concept of community leadership involves influence, power, and input into public decision-making over one or more spheres of activity. Members of the local Extension advisory council are people who are active and in leadership positions in other community groups and who are viewed as community leaders. The leadership functions and skills are similar to those needed for organization leadership, but in community leadership we are dealing with the same thing at a more complex level. Community leadership is more complex because of the many and varied groups with different viewpoints and agendas and possibly competing interests.

2. Team leadership. Leadership is a process usually involving a number of persons rather than one individual, a shared effort. Commodity groups, county fair boards, and judging teams of all kinds are three examples where team leadership is essential. In the first of twelve papers for the Leadership Studies Program, John W. Gardner, former Secretary of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, notes: "Most of the leadership that can be called effective involves a number of individuals acting in a team relationship . . . team leadership enhances the possibility that different styles of leadership can be brought to bear simultaneously" (1986, pp. 15-16).

3. Situational leadership. This perspective stresses the interrelationships of behaviors and characteristics among leaders and group members and the situation in which they find themselves. The leader's behavior is associated with tasks and relationships as well as with the ability to be flexible. Leadership style needs flexibility to adjust to members' ability and willingness to carry out specific activities. The leader of a resource development committee may be very anxious to reach certain objectives and may be a "hard driver." If the committee members have less experience and are not clear on objectives, the leader will need to recognize this situation and work within these limits.

4. Transactional leadership. Leadership is viewed as a reciprocal process between leaders and followers in which each influences the behavior of the other. This mutual influence helps to establish the leadership functions in a particular group at a particular time. This approach focuses on the communication between leaders and group members. Leadership is earned by those who members believe are competent and trustworthy. 4-H club members, junior leaders, and other volunteer leaders, working together, agree on assignments and club goals. All persons have a part in making these decisions through their participation. Each individual has the opportunity to influence others in the group. This is learning leadership by doing it.

These four perspectives are not mutually exclusive, but should be viewed as a whole. Together they offer the fullest understanding of what makes for effective leadership and what needs to be understood to help people prepare for and carry out leadership functions, particularly at the community level, the most complex level at which we work.

Before presenting a synthesis of leadership literature and the results of research on leadership, a few introductory points will be made. Much of what follows builds on these points. They are not listed in any particular order. You may consider some more important than others. They are, how-

ever, highly interrelated and should be considered together.

1. Leadership is a process and is shared by members of the group or organization through a complex relationship between the person exercising leadership at a particular point in time, the followers, the nature of the group or organization, the issue or project under consideration, and the larger context in which the group or organization functions.

2. Leadership is not distributed equally throughout any population. Some people, because of personal traits (such as self-confidence, energy, ability), position, personal characteristics (such as race, sex, age), or other factors, fulfill leadership functions more consistently than do others in the population. How to identify such people will be discussed later in this module.

3. Community leadership functions are most often performed by volunteers. People volunteer for a wide variety of reasons, but the important point to remember is that they are volunteers. They serve as long as the work satisfies some personal or altruistic need. Therefore, it is important to be aware of these needs, to match needs with tasks whenever possible, and to help group members meet their needs when you can.

4. Leadership skills are gained through practicing these skills. People need opportunities to learn to perform leadership roles, tasks, and functions and to apply what they learn to a wide variety of situations. This involves "processing"; that is, understanding what is taking place in one situation and transferring that understanding and skill to a new setting. Involving people in a leadership development process means helping them *learn-through-doing*. Educational efforts in leadership should never be limited to a classroom setting.

5. The three major functions of leadership are accomplishing tasks, building group relationships, and meeting the needs of group members. No one of these is most important, because each is necessary for a healthy and productive group. These three functions need to be carried out simultaneously.

Learning Objectives

After completing module 4, *Developing Leadership*, Extension educators will be able to:

1. Understand and apply the behaviors and skills involved in leadership practice, thereby improving their ability to perform in leadership roles related to their job responsibilities.

2. Identify and work effectively with current leaders in groups, organizations, and communities, as well as identify and involve potential leaders.

3. Develop and carry out educational activities that will strengthen leadership capabilities among others.

4. Better understand what motivates people to participate in group, organization, and community activities, and act on these understandings.

Leadership Development and Public Policy Education: A Look at the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy

By John J. Kornacki, Director, Leadership Development Program in Public Policy Education, National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy, Resources for the Future, Washington, D.C.

In 1985, the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy, a unit of the Washington, D.C., based nonprofit research organization, Resources for the Future, initiated an educational program to provide young professionals whose careers involved the food system with an opportunity to enhance their understanding of food and farm policies, to expand their interactions with national leaders on agricultural matters, and to promote improved leadership for agriculture. Following is a description of that program, now in its third year of operation.

Background

As mentioned in the first book of this series, *Community Leadership Development: Implictions for Extension*, virtually all leadership training programs aim to improve participants' ability to influence group decision-making and action. Aside from the Heavenly Host, there is perhaps no meaningfully higher level group on which to exert influence in decision-making and action than the U.S. Congress and the federal agencies. Influence at this level has several prerequisites, but paramount among them are a thorough understanding of the issues of concern and an appreciation for the operations of government.

Many leadership training programs deal with enhancing the understanding of the Congress and the specific issues that may be before it. In fact, several federal agencies run their own in-house programs to familiarize employees with the vagaries of bureaucracy while training them in various subject areas. The Congressional Research Service, an arm of the U.S. Congress, runs regular training programs for new House and Senate staff members on legislative procedure and specific issue areas, such as agricultural policy. Management and administrative training elements are often part of these programs. The Department of Interior, for example, runs a Departmental Manager Development program to "provide managerial development to participants and increase their knowledge of the Department so that they may fill top level career management positions in the mission and support areas of the Secretariat and bureaus" (1985).

Organizations like the Brookings Institution and Congressional Quarterly run seminar programs for individuals and groups interested in furthering their understanding of specific policy issues or governmental procedures on such subjects as arms control options or the economic effects of the deregulation of industry.

One of the more curious and confusing areas of public policy is agriculture. In preparation for the debates of the 1985 farm bill, Resources for the Future (RFF) decided to expand its focus on study from natural resources and the environmental questions to those involving agriculture, the largest user of natural resources.

Resources for the Future

RFF traces its origins to several leaders of the conservation movement, especially Horace M. Albright; to the natural resources staff of the Ford Foundation, notably Chester C. Davis; and to President Truman's Materials Policy Commission of 1950-52, established to evaluate the ability of natural resources for national needs.

RFF's founding long preceded widespread public awareness of resource and environmental problems. To date, RFF has created and diffused an increasingly large body of knowledge about resources and the environment, primarily through publishing books and reports widely used in college and university courses and by professionals and lay people concerned with resource issues. Through these publications and through staff appointments, fellowships, and grants, RFF has helped to develop a community of leaders in the natural resource and environmental fields.

From its inception, RFF has adopted a balanced, systematic view of the critical resource and environmental challenges that face the nation and the world. In placing a central value on objectivity and scholarship, its aim has been to contribute knowledge to national debates about natural resource issues. RFF is an advocate of sound public policies based on fundamental research and analysis and grounded on clear, thorough, and accurate understanding of the physical, the social, and, particularly, the economic realities. It encourages the consideration of all these perspectives in decision-making about resource conservation, development, and use.

National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy

The relationships among agriculture and the natural resource base have long been an interest of RFF. In 1961, Emery Castle, the president of RFF, and several others, including Kenneth R. Farrell, then Administrator of the Economics and Statistics Services of U.S. Department of Agriculture, recognized that the circumstances of U.S. agriculture required a basic reassessment of policies, options for the future, and their economic, social, and institutional implications. It was Farrell, in fact, who had previously called for creation of an independent policy institute in his presidential address to the American Agricultural Economics Association in 1976. He had noted a decline in quality, policy-relevant research, and analysis in both universities and government. He also urged his fellow social scientists to broaden their perspectives, cultivate new alliances, and experiment with new institutional arrangements (Farrell, 1976).

Castle subsequently hired Farrell to develop a food and farm policy program at RFF in 1982. In 1984, the National

Center for Food and Agricultural Policy was established by a grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The National Center's work has three major objectives:

- to contribute to informed debate on public policy issues by enhancing the quality, and effective dissemination of policy analysis;
- to improve public understanding of national public policy issues, policy alternatives and their implications, and the policy-making process; and
- to promote an enlightened agricultural policy leadership throughout the agricultural community — business, government, university, and agriculture-related organizations.

These objectives take the form of activities in three areas: policy analysis, communication and outreach, and leadership development. The policy analysis component is focused on how food and agricultural policies relate to trade and international linkages, natural resources and the environment, nutrition, technology, and the macroeconomy. Communication activities involve seminars, briefings, workshops, and occasional Congressional testimony. Publications such as policy briefs, monographs, and an annual policy review are also part of the communication program. Leadership development has several parts, including a resident fellowship program, opportunities for staff development, and special Leadership Development Program.

The Leadership Development Program

As previously noted, the National Center initiated a four-week public policy education program for mid-career professionals in 1985. The Leadership Development Program, as it is called, gives up to twenty-five individuals the opportunity to participate in a series of specially designed workshops and seminars on various policy subjects germane to food and agriculture. The participants also meet with selected members of Congress, agency officials, foreign dignitaries, and noted policy experts. Each participant undertakes a policy study under the supervision of the National Center. Some leadership training and communication exercises are also part of the program.

The premise of the Leadership Development Program, like all activities of the National Center, is that the circumstances underlying food and agricultural policies have changed; the issues are more complex, interdependent, and volatile. The leaders who will operate in this new policy environment will require new perspectives, a broader vision, and an enhanced understanding of how public policy is formed and implemented. The activities of the Leadership Development Program are designed to address these concerns.

Conclusion

In many ways, the National Center's leadership program resembles other Washington-based leadership and public policy education programs. It endeavors to apprise participants of sophisticated economic analyses as well as subtle political processes. Yet it is also like the state agricultural and rural leadership programs both in focus of attention and in clientele.

The Leadership Development Program of the National Center may be viewed as a logical descendant and extension of the Kellogg Farmers Study Program established at Michigan State University in 1965 (Howell, et al., 1982). The similarity, however, goes beyond the common benefactor. Then, as now, there was a concern about leadership, a concern about public policy, and a willingness to intervene on behalf of the next generation. In food and agricultural matters, effective leadership requires an undergirding in public policy. The National Center, like the Kellogg Farmers Study Program and its sister programs, endeavors to sustain and nurture the growth of leaders for the twenty-first century by improving their understanding of the policy issues and processes of government.

Leadership and the ability to influence decision-making is really a continuous stream of skills and perspectives. The currents at the national level may be stronger, but they are not unlike the flow that passes the communities downstream. The ability to navigate involves skills and perspectives that are teachable and available to all.

References

FARRELL, KENNETH R. "Public Policy, The Public Interest and Agricultural Economics," *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, Vol. 58, No. 5, December 1976.

HOWELL, ROBERT E., IVAN LEE WEIR, and ANNABEL KIRSCHNER COOK. *The Development of Rural Leadership: Problems, Procedures, and Insights*. Battle Creek, Michigan: W. K. Kellogg Foundation, 1982.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, Department Manager Development Program, Washington, D.C.: Office of Personnel Management, 1985.

Research-Practice Linkages in Community Leadership Development: Results of a National Study

By Frank A. Fear, Associate Professor of Research Development, Lela Vandenberg, Ph.D., Candidate in Nonformal Ed. and Community Development, and Manfred Thullen, Professor of Resource Development, all at Michigan State University

This manuscript was prepared as an activity associated with Project MICLO 3268 of the Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station and previously distributed to the respondents of the study. The study described here was funded by The North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, Iowa State University.

The authors wish to acknowledge the contributions of Brian Williams to the study design and Nancy Lee Radtke to the study design and data analysis.

Background

A tenet of the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) is that information and educational programs should be based on the results of scientific research (Riesbeck and Reynolds, 1976). The explicit linkage between research and practice is one of the reasons that the U.S. land-grand university system has been hailed as a model for information/technology transfer.

In this paper, we report findings from a national study on research-practice linkages. Attention is focused on community leadership development (CLD) programming within the CES. The study is a response to high-priority research recommendations made by members of the North Central Regional Interest Network on Community Leadership Programs in 1984.

Study Purpose

A diverse group of actors participate in CLD programming within the CES. Activities are being carried out in all fifty states, span the four CES program areas, and cut across disciplinary boundaries. Recent and important attempts have been made to inventory this activity and to document the nature and scope of CLD programming (e.g., *Community Leadership Development: Implications for Extension*, a report by National Extension Task Force for Community Leadership, 1986).

The study reported here complements, yet differs from, other contemporary efforts. In this inquiry, we are less concerned about who is doing what and more concerned about *investigating the conceptual underpinnings of CLD work.* We chose this focus because virtually nothing is known about the types of leadership concepts that CLD workers have and use in their programming efforts or about the sources of that information.

Because of this dearth of knowledge, we preceded the national study with a one-year effort to become better acquainted with the existing knowledge base. The intention was to investigate the CLD research-practice linkage using the literature as a frame of reference.

By the end of our one-year inquiry, we had developed a literature-based framework. That framework included three components:

1. The definitional component, which defined *leadership, community leadership, and community leadership development* and was largely drawn from the sociology, psychology, and management literatures.

2. The substantive component, which identified concepts associated with community leadership and the contexts within which leadership is exercised in organizations, communities, and during the community development process. This material was drawn from an array of fields and disciplines, including psychology, sociology, management, and community development.

3. The normative component, which suggested a method for designing and conducting CLD programs, and was guided by concepts and guidelines drawn from the community development and adult education literatures.

Study Methods

Sample Selection Process. Because of the diversity in CLD programming within the CES and the lack of a clear-cut distinction between leadership and community leadership programming, delineating the population of CLD actors operating within the land-grant system presented a considerable challenge. We also recognized that some states are more actively involved in CLD work than others.

In light of the exploratory nature of our research, we felt that the best approach would be to identify the states most actively involved in CLD and then to include in our study sample the most active actors: state-level specialists, multi-county workers, and county-level workers. To accomplish this goal, we used a two-stage, purposive (nonprobability) sampling design.

The first task was to specifically define "CLD program." We used four criteria — content, audience, level of organization, and purpose — as parameters for this subject matter. We then began identifying the most active states. Three data sources were tapped during this process: (1) a phone survey of twenty-one knowledgeables was used to solicit impressions about the most active states; (2) the results of a 1984 study on CLD programming activity (NCRIN, 1984) were reviewed; and (3) the "Narrative Accomplishment Reporting System" (NARS), for the period 1983-85, was analyzed.

The assembled data were then analyzed using seven criteria (e.g., strength of a knowledgeable's recommendation). A median state score was calculated on the number of times a score for a criterion fell above the median score for all states. Seventeen states received scores of "7"; all but one state agreed to participate in the study.

As we reviewed the geographic distribution of the re-

maining sixteen states, we noted that the North Central and the Southern regions were overrepresented and that the other two regions, Northeastern and Western, were underrepresented. To represent the latter two regions more equally, we added a state to each of these regions. This left us with a sample of eighteen states:

- Northeast Region: NY, PA, VT
- North Central Region: IN, IA, MI, MN, MO, WI
- Southern Region: AL, FL, GA, MS, NC, VA
- Western Region: CO, WA, WY

The second stage in the sampling design — identifying CES workers involved in CLD work — began with augmenting the CLD definition so as to solicit the "most active" workers in each state. This would give us an opportunity to study those workers within the states who were most actively involved in CLD work.

Information for the state-identification process was used to develop a list of knowledgeables for each of the eighteen states. We attempted to contact each knowledgeable on each list in order to ask which workers in their state should be included in our sample. A "snowball" approach to identifying knowlegeables was used so that each contacted knowledgeable was invited to add the names of other knowledgeables to the list. We included in our sample all the names suggested by the knowledgeables and deleted a name only if a knowledgeable felt that the person should be excluded.

This process yielded a total of 650 CES workers. Nearly 80 percent of those in the sample represented the North Central (40.2 percent) or Southern (39.7 percent) regions. The remaining 20 percent were nearly evenly split between the Northeastern (10.5 percent) and Western (9.7 percent) regions. The largest number of workers by state were from: Mississippi (88), Pennsylvania (64), Michigan (64) and Missouri (59). The smallest number of workers by state were from Colorado (9), Wyoming (19), Indiana (20), and Florida (23).

Data Collection Instrument. A mail questionnaire was used as the data collection instrument. Questions were organized in six sections: (1) theoretical preferences for defining community leadership; (2) the substance of CLD programs; (3) the process of designing CLD programs; (4) theoretical preferences for defining leadership and for specific leadership concepts; (5) assessment of the current research-practice linkage in CLD; and (6) background information on the respondent. We drew extensively from our literature review and frameworking to design the questionnaire.

A panel of experts from Michigan State University was assembled to pretest the instrument. Changes were made in instrument content and format in light of panel members' feedback.

Data Collection Process. A modified version of the Dillman (1977) method was used to collect the data. Each potential respondent was contacted up to five times — from a notification letter sent before the questionnaire mailing to a third reminder letter.

To stimulate questionnaire response, all persons in the sample were told that five "early" respondents would win a book on leadership selected from a list of several books that we had identified. In addition, all respondents received a journal article on themes in leadership theory and research (Jago, 1982).

Of the 650 persons in the sample, 492 (75.7 percent) completed and returned questionnaires. The number of actual respondents vis-a-vis the number in the sample by state and region were nearly identical; in only two cases — once at the state level (MS) and once at the regional level (North Central) — were the percentage differences more than +/− 1 percent (and only slightly over or under 1 percent). Regional return rates ranged from 71.4 percent (Western) to 78.2 percent (North Central) and state return rates varied from 65.4 percent (MN) to 95 percent (IN). The median state return rate was nearly 80 percent, and seven states had return rates of >80 percent.

Profile of the Respondents. About 60 percent of the respondents were male, and the average respondent was 43.8 years old. The median level of CES experience was about 11 years, whereas the median number of years working in CLD was 10.2 and the median portion of time working on CLD programming was 19.8 percent.

About one-third of the respondents identified themselves as working within the community resource development program area. Nearly 30 percent represented home economics, and about 15 percent each were affiliated with 4-H and agriculture. About 70 percent had field-level responsibilities.

Nearly all respondents had advanced degrees. The modal credential was the master's degree, and nearly 30 percent held doctorates. The majority of respondents held degrees in a social science field.

Theoretical Preferences for Defining Community Leadership. Is there a preferred way of defining community leadership? Based on the analysis of our study data, the answer, generally, is no.

We presented the respondents with three definitions of community leadership. The first definition, and perhaps the one to which the respondents had been most widely exposed, is a definition created by the National Extension Task Force on Community Leadership (1985). The second definition was a "textbook" definition drawn from Edwards and Jones (1976). The third definition was created by our research staff as part of the work associated with designing our literature-based framework (Vandenberg, et al., 1985).

We felt that each definition stressed important, but different, concepts about community leadership. The Network definition exmphasized community leadership within the context of the public decision-making process; the Edwards and Jones definition stressed community leadership as mutual influence associated with collective efforts; and our definition squarely placed community leadership within the community development process.

We asked the respondents to rate each definition on a

scale of 1-5 in terms of its importance to their personal view of community leadership (1 = not important; 5 = very important). Then we asked the respondents to select what they considered to be the best definition from their point of view.

All three definitions were rated 4 or 5 by more than 50 percent of the respondents, and the median ratings ranged from 4.0 (Network definition) to 3.5 (Textbook definition). Slight preference was given to the Network definition in that about two-thirds rated it "high" importance (4 or 5) while less than 10 percent rated it "low" importance (1 or 2).

When asked to pick the best definition, the only significant difference was among the state-level specialists. A majority (50.7 percent) selected the Network definition and an equal number of the remaining specialists selected the other definitions. Field staff preferred our definition (39.4 percent) with the Network definition being selected by nearly 38 percent of the respondents.

The Substance of CLD Programs. Are there common themes in the content of CLD programs? We found that the answer to this question, generally, is yes.

First, we asked respondents to assess 63 possible "process" topics for a CLD program. We drew this list from a disparate set of sources, including textbooks, actual CLD programs, and course syllabi. Topics were organized in four categories: (1) developing personal resources (24 topics); (2) working with groups and organizations (14 topics); (3) understanding communities and the community development process (15 topics); and (4) understanding the public policy process (10 topics).

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each topic for CLD programming (1 = not important; 5 = very important). Then they were asked to indicate whether or not they currently included each topic in their CLD programming.

Most respondents felt that each topic was generally important. But were some topics considered to be more important than others? We found that the answer to this question was yes. The study data revealed that when we ranked the responses according to the percentage of respondents who rated each topic "5" (very important), eight of the ten top-ranked topics were associated with the "developing personal resources" category. Example; topics include problem-solving techniques, team-building skills, interpersonal communication, and developing listening skills. Conversely, six of the ten lowest ranked topics were associated with "understanding communities and the CD process" and "understanding the public policy process." Examples of these topics include the federal legislative process, regional organizations, analyzing social systems, and the ethics of change.

Further analysis revealed that these orientations were in evidence relative to the topics most and least included in CLD programs. Seven of the ten most included topics were from the developing personal resources category. On the other hand, five of the topics on the list of least included topics pertained to "understanding community and the CD process" and "understanding the public policy process."

The Process of Designing CLD Programs. Does a theoretically sound approach to CLD program design and delivery seem feasible to CLD workers? We found that the answer to this question is definitely yes.

To study this question, we drew from the literature on program design, andragogy, adult learning, and extension education to create a six-phase model of the program design and delivery process: (1) preanalysis (consisting of three tasks that should be accomplished before overall CLD programs are planned; e.g., analysis of social conditions); (2) preplanning (consisting of six tasks that should be accomplished before specific CLD programs are planned; e.g., determining staff and citizen roles); (3) involving intended clientele in the process (consisting of five tasks that are client based; e.g., organizing a planning group); (4) planning (consisting of four tasks that pertain to general planning requirements; e.g., acquiring the necessary financial resources); (5) implementation (consisting of fifteen tasks associated with implementing actual CLD programs; e.g., how to best structure the learning situation); and (6) evaluation (consisting of ten tasks associated with assessment program performance; e.g., using impact evaluation results to design future programs).

We asked the respondents to assess each of the nearly 50 tasks in terms of *feasibility* — the extent to which the task is both appropriate and possible given available resources (time, staff, funds) and the urgencies of the "real world." In a very real way, we wanted to determine how well theory matched up with reality. The respondent assigned a 1-5 score to each task, where 1 = not feasible at all and 5 = very feasible.

As part of our analysis, we created index scores by element. Each respondent's scores for all the tasks in an element were totaled, and high, medium, and low scores were calculated based on the distribution of scores for that element. The top 20 percent of the total scores were designated high for each element; the bottom 20 percent of the total scores were designated low for each element. This procedure allowed us to compare high and low scores across elements despite the fact that an unequal number of tasks were associated with the elements. Analyses of these data revealed that the high index score was significantly higher than the low index score for each of the six elements.

While general support was given to all elements, the preplanning and evaluation elements were especially supported; six of the ten top-rated tasks were associated with these elements (e.g., "Just prior to planning the overall program, make sure that all involved staff members have a common undersanding of program objectives and the processes to be used"; "Communicate evaluation results to participants."). Although most of the respondents generally supported most tasks, several tasks associated with implementation were overrepresented on the list of tasks that were ranked lower in feasibility. Six of the ten lower-ranked items pertained to implementation tasks (e.g., "When implementing specific programs, involved participants in playing teaching roles as

much as possible.").

Theoretical Preferences for Defining Leadership and for Specific Leadership Concepts. Do the respondents generally prefer conceptualizing leadership according to one or more of the literature-based leadership perspectives? The answer to this question is definitely yes.

We felt that in many ways this question was at the very heart of our study purpose. We say this for two reasons. First, the leadership literature stands as the centerpiece of CLD work, and we wanted to determine if there is a particular theoretical perspective with which most workers affiliate. Second, to the best of our knowledge, no attempt has ever been made to assess empirically the theoretical affiliation of Extension staff with various leadership theories. Although we view the merits associated with a diversity of viewpoints, we were hoping to find a higher degree of agreement than diversity. Presumably, persons working in the same organization and focusing on the same type of leadership development (i.e., within community contexts) would tend to agree more than disagree.

Our first task was to distill the findings of our literature review into a set of reasonably stated, and substantively different, leadership perspectives. Six perspectives were presented to the respondents:

The Trait Perspective — From a trait perspective, leadership is conceived of as a person's influence on a group of other people. It is thought that certain leader traits cause certain responses in followers. Trait research has focused on identifying the characteristics that distinguish leaders from followers and effective leaders from ineffective leaders.

The Behavior Perspective — Although a behavior perspective also centers on leadership as a person's influence on a group, the influence is thought to be caused by the leader's behaviors as opposed to personal traits. In other words, certain leader behaviors cause certain responses in followers. The behavior research has attempted to identify the most effective set of leader behaviors.

The Situational Perspective — From the situational perspective, leadership is still viewed as influence on others, but the influence is affected by contextual factors or situational variables. Thus, leader traits and behaviors, modified by situational variables, cause certain responses in followers. Research according to this approach has aimed to discover effective leader traits and behaviors, given specific situational variables.

The Contingency Perspective — Originally classified within the situational perspective, we decided to name this as a discrete perspective because several notions directly contradict concepts embodied in other situational theories. Although the important influence of situational variables on leader effectiveness is assumed, only *one* leader characteristic (the leader's task/relationship orientation) and one broad situational variable (the "favorableness" of the situation) are thought to be important. According to contingency theorists, the degree of "fit" between a leader's task/relationship orientation and the favorableness of the situation determines how effective the leader will be in that situation. Research has focused on defining situational favorability, given a leader's relatively stable personality orientation.

The Transactional Perspective — This perspective is transactional in that the influence exerted in leadership situations is recognized as a reciprocal exchange between leaders and followers. In other words, leadership is a transaction in which leaders and followers mutually influence and respond to each other in an exchange process. Research on this approach has focused on how the leader-follower relationship develops and changes over time and on what kinds of exchange processes are most effective.

The Attributional Perspective — According to the attributional perspective, each individual has certain conceptions about leadership and certain expectations about how effective leaders should behave. In order for a leader to be considered effective, he or she must measure up to followers' perceptions of a leader. Thus, leadership is a perceptual construct attributed to others by those involved in the leadership situation. Attribution research has attempted to describe individuals' perceptions about effective leadership, the analytical process of attributing leadership to others, and the processes used by leaders when attributing follower behavior to certain causes.

After these perspectives were delineated, we set out to describe, in statement form, the most important features of each perspective. Fifty-six statements were generated and randomly ordered in the same questionnaire section using a table of random numbers. Respondents were asked to evaluate each statement by selecting one number, on a scale of 1-5, in terms of their personal agreement with the substance of the statement. The scale was 1 = do not at all agree to 5 = agree very much.

Because of the unequal number of statements across perspectives, we once again used an index approach for the purpose of comparison. This procedure generated important distinctions in the responses. One perspective was clearly the most favored — the situational perspective. Nearly 85 percent of the respondents were classified as being in high agreement, almost 20 percent higher than the next highest rated perspective, the transactional perspective. When we analyzed the responses by respondent characteristic — area of appointment (CRD, 4-H, Home Ec., Ag.), type of appointment (field/state), length of time in CLD work, percentage of time devoted to CLD work, sex of respondent, age of respondent, and educational background in leadership — the strong affiliation with the situational perspective was clearly reflected in the data. On the other hand, far less preference was given to the contingency and behavior perspectives.

When we ranked the fifty-six statements by the rating scores, we found that five of the ten top-ranked statements were associated with the situational perspective. An example of these statements is: "Some followers may need more direction and authority, while others may need to be given more responsibility and opportunity to participate in de-

cisions." Three of the other top-ranked statements are associated with the transactional perspective. An example is: "Leaders gain credibility by being trustworthy and competent." As anticipated, when we inspected the lowest ranked statements in terms of rating scores, four of the ten were behavior statements (e.g., "There is one best behavioral style for all leadership situations, high relationship orientation and high task orientation.") and two of the ten were contingency statements (e.g., "An individual's leadership style is relatively stable and difficult to change.").

After the respondents had rated each of the fifty-six statements, we presented them with six unlabeled definitions of leadership. The definition list actually included definitions of five of the six previously presented perspectives — trait, behavior, situational, transactional, and attributional. We did not include a definition of the contingency perspective (because we believe it to be of a lesser significance than the other perspectives). However, we did add a sixth definition — one of our own. We refer to this definition as a "linkages" perspective on leadership because, in light of our literature review, we believe that leadership is best viewed by drawing concepts from a variety of perspectives (Vandenberg, et al., 1985). Our "linkages" definition was:

> Leadership consists of three aspects: a process of using influence to help a group achieve its goals; the beliefs individuals have about what makes effective leaders; and the qualities, behaviors, skills, and knowledge of persons perceived as effective leaders.

We then asked the respondents to rate each of the six definitions in terms of the extent to which the definition reflected their personal view of leadership. Again, a five-point scale was used, where 1 = not at all and 5 = very much.

When this global approach was used, a clear pattern of response emerged once again. When we analyzed the percentage of respondents who had selected 4 or 5 on the scale, the transactional (78.7 percent), linkages (67 percent) and situational (64.2 percent) perspectives were heavily favored. The attributional (39.8 percent) trait (35.1 percent), and behavior (28.2 percent) perspectives were not as popular.

This trend was further emphasized when we asked the respondents to select the one definition that best reflects their personal view of leadership. More than a third of the respondents selected the transactional definition; nearly 30 percent opted for the linkages perspective; and about one in four picked the situational perspective. Less than 4 percent of the respondents selected any one of the other three perspectives.

Assessement of the Current Research-Practice Linkage in CLD. Did the respondents have strong feelings about the nature of the research-practice linkage in CLD and recommendations regarding how to strengthen the linkage? The answer to this question is definitely no.

As a background to asking questions about the research-practice linkage in CLD, we wanted to obtain a better picture of the respondents' backgrounds in leadership and CLD. We addressed these questions: (1) What are the respondents' sources of background knowledge about CLD? (e.g., degree program, in-service training); (2) To what extent do the respondents have formal educational backgrounds in leadership and CLD; and (3) what sources of information do they rely upon when designing CLD programs?

With respect to the sources of background knowledge, we presented seven different sources to the respondents (e.g., from personal experience to reading to formal education). The list was heavily weighted toward training sources (e.g., sessions sponsored by a professional organization or society) rather than personal experience or formal education (i.e., degree program work).

"Personal experience" was rated as the source making the most contribution (about a 4.5 median score on a 1-5 scale, where 1 = no contribution and 5 = major contribution). "Formal degree program" was rated in the middle of the scale with a median score of 2.8 for the field staff and 3.1 for the state staff.

In our exploration of formal education as a source of knowledge, we defined it as the inclusion of leadership and/or community leadership subject matter in one's formal degree program: (1) as a topic in a course; (2) as a course; (3) through experiential fieldwork; (4) as a focus of research; and (5) as a major or minor concentration.

Study data revealed that about half of the respondents indicated that leadership had been included as part of their formal education; about 40 percent reported that community leadership had been included as part of their formal education. Surprisingly, there were no significant differences when we compared formal degree credentials between the field and state staffs or by percentage time on CLD. About 55 percent of the state-level respondents reported that they had formal background in leadership, and nearly 43 percent said that they had an educational background in community leadership. And those with low percentage appointment in CLD reported just about the same educational background in leadership and community leadership as those with high percentage appointment in CLD.

What about the nature of the educational background for those who reported some formal exposure to leadership and/or community leadership subject matter? In other words, how had these persons been formally exposed? When we analyzed these data, a clear pattern emerged: respondents were generally less experienced than more experienced. With respect to community leadership, for example, 36.2 percent reported that they had been exposed to community leadership as a topic in a course, 22.8 percent said that they had taken a course, 16.5 percent noted that they had done fieldwork, 13 percent had conducted research, and 3.5 percent had majored or minored in the subject.

As for sources of information for designing CLD programs, we learned that certain personal sources (e.g., information received from an Extension specialist, and personal experience) were both top-rated and top-ranked from among a list of thirteen different sources. Among those

sources were scholarly books, scholarly journals, popular books, and popular magazines. The literature-based sources were rated and ranked lower. As a specific follow-up to the literature-based alternative, we asked the respondents to identify the one most important literature source that they rely upon in their CLD work. Nearly 42 percent listed an Extension publication, and 32 percent gave a reference to a scholarly book (many of which can be considered as older "classics").

With the background information presented here, perhaps it should not come as a surprise that the respondents as a group did not clearly identify "research gaps" or ways to strengthen the CLD research-practice linkage. When we asked the respondents to evaluate the adequacy of research in seven areas pertinent to CLD work (e.g., small groups, organizations, community development), roughly 20 percent responded "don't know" to each question. Another 26-30 percent responded with a 3 on a 5-point scale, where 1 = not adequate and 5 = exceptional.

When asked to respond to seven potential problems that might contribute to weaker research-practice ties (e.g., researchers not listening to practitioners' recommendations; research not applicable in practice), the highest median rating on a 5-point scale (where 1 = not a problem and 5 = serious problem) was 3.49 and the lowest median rating was 2.53. About 25 percent of those responding selected 3 as their response to each posed situation, with the highest percentage of 3s coming in response to the statement: "Not enough research is being done on CLD."

The pattern of uncertainty continued when we analyzed responses to nine potential ways to improve the CLD research-practice linkage. Alternative solutions that we posed to respondents included: "more research updates at inservices," "more applied articles in journals," and "more AES research projects." Again, a 5-point response scale was used (1 = not helpful and 5 = very helpful). Between 21 percent and 34 percent selected 3 in response to each potential improvement, and the top-rated improvement was the most generic of the alternatives, "more administrative support."

Conclusion and Recommendations. Our intention was to create a general picture of the current status of the linkage between CLD research and practice in the CES. We were pleased to find considerable agreement on certain topics (e.g., substance of CLD programs, normative orientation toward CLD program design, theoretical perspectives on leadership). But agreement on issues should not be confused with research-practice linkage. One of the themes in our research data was that very few significant differences were found when study results were analyzed by level of leadership and CLD education, level of the time on CLD, and percentage appointment in CLD. In a more "mature" area, we would expect to find marked differences between persons with more and less exposure/experience in their subject matter.

Taking the study data into comprehensive consideration, our conclusion is that the linkage is tenuous at best. Perhaps our study results only suggest areas of convergence and divergence in this relatively young field. Yet we believe that the situation is much better than one should expect, given the following: (1) rather limited educational background in leadership and CLD as reported by those working in the field; (2) the incredible diversity of persons working in CLD; and (3) the limited number of CLD-related research projects being conducted within the land-grant system (according to our review of CRIS reports).

Consequently, we would prefer to couch our comments in the context of "opportunities," rather than focus attention on existing problems. We strongly believe that there are considerable opportunities for improving the research-practice linkage in an area where high recognition among clientele abounds.

With this as background, we advance these recommendations:

1. Leadership and community leadership curricula at land-grant institutions should be improved: the number of courses and the interrelationships between course (introductory/advanced) must be enhanced.

2. In-service training programs should be held routinely for persons working in CLD. Special emphasis should be given to including "research updates" as part of these programs.

3. We should expect better educational credentials from those who are employed to do CLD programming work. If we take this area with any seriousness, then persons with little or no formal educational background should not be expected to do CLD work.

4. Our data suggest that at least some state specialists may not be specialists in CLD. If this situation is generally true, then a serious effort must be made to hire persons with better CLD credentials, require them to conduct CLD research, and expect them to take responsibility for designing and conducting in-service training programs. We should also expect state specialists to be solid contributors to the knowledge base.

5. It is inconceivable that so much CES activity should be going on nationally when so little research is being conducted in the AES. One way to improve both research and practice is to specifically link CES educational programs with ongoing work in research. At the very least, one CLD-related research project should be supported at each land-grant university in which CLD programming is taking place.

Certainly, other recommendations will emerge as our study data are further disseminated and discussed. We believe that CLD work represents a worthwhile and important sphere of activity within the CES, especially for those in the community development field. Indeed, as we have stated elsewhere (Fear, et al., 1985), there may be no topic more important to community development.

The recommendations made here will certainly require additional resources. With so many areas competing for the Extension dollar, we recognize that these demands could not come at a worse time. However, if we are committed to maintaining this program area at a quality level, then our recommendations should be conceived not so much as demands as a reasonable set of expectations.

References

DILLMAN, DON A. *Mail and Telephone Surveys: The Total Design Method*. New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1978.

EDWARDS, A. D., and D. JONES. *Community and Community Development*. The Hague: Mouton, 1976.

FEAR, FRANK A., LELA VANDENBERG, MANFRED THULLEN, and BRIAN WILLIAMS. "Toward a Literature-Based Framework for Community Leadership Development." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Community Development Society, Logan, Utah, August 1985.

JAGO, A. G. "Leadership: Perspectives in Theory and Research." *Management Science*, Vol. 28, pp. 315-36.

NATIONAL EXTENSION TASK FORCE FOR COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP. 1985 Plan of Work. *Community Leadership Development: Implications for Extension*. University Park, Pennsylvania: The Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development, 1986.

NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL INTEREST NETWORK ON COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP PROGRAMS. *Extension Community Leadership Programs in the United States: A Survey of Community Leadership Programs by the North Central Regional Interest Network*. Ames, Iowa: North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, Iowa State University, 1984.

REISBECK, ROBERT F. and JAMES REYNOLDS. "Extension Is Involved." In C. A. Vines and M. A. Anderson, eds., *Heritage Horizons — Extension's Commitment to People*. Madison, Wisconsin: Journal of Extension, 1976.

VANDENBERG, L., F. FEAR, M. THULLEN, and B. WILLIAMS. *Toward a Framework for Extension Community Leadership Development Training*. An Interim Report to the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development. East Lansing, Michigan: Department of Resource Development, 1985.

Family Community Leadership

By Lois R. Basset, Extension Homemaker, Washington and Consultant to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation; and James C. Barron Extension Economist, Washington State University, and Consultant to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation

What Is FCL?

Family Community Leadership (FCL) is an educational program jointly sponsored by Cooperative Extension Services and Extension Homemakers. This program, funded in part by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, offers leadership workshops to prepare participants for involvement in public policy decisionmaking affecting families and communities.

Who Can Participate?

Anyone who will make a commitment to work in the FCL program for twelve to twenty-four days a year is eligible to participate. The program's primary audience is women.

What Is FCL Special?

Because FCL teaches skills with the purpose of increasing women's leadership and involvement in community affairs, it is innovative. FCL's teamwork is new also. Volunteers and Extension staff work as teams in all parts of the program: decision-making, planning and management, teaching, and evaluation.

How Does It Work?

Participants in FCL are taught by peers. They practice skills related to citizen participation and learn to become teachers themselves. In this way, the effect of the program is multiplied.

What Is Taught?

The basic FCL training program includes thirty hours of instruction in six areas: Leadership and Communication; Working with Groups; Issue Analysis and Resolution; Community Affairs and Public Policy; Volunteerism; Teaching Methods.

Goals of the FCL Program

Education — to understand the complexities of public issues and how to solve public problems; to become competent in management and decision-making skills.

Participation — to involve women who have learned to lead effectively in public affairs on family-related issues.

Organization — to develop resources within Cooperative Extension and Extension Homemakers that support leaders and groups.

How Is FCL Funded?

The W. K. Kellogg Foundation provided the initial capital, and participating states must contribute matching funds to support Extension faculty. In-kind contributions from Extension Homemakers and other volunteers support training activities.

Main Elements of the FCL Project

The main elements of the FCL project are as follows:

- A team approach that links volunteers and Extension staff in the management of project policy, implementation, teaching, and evaluation.
- A curriculum developed from disciplines currently incorporated in Home Economics and Community Resource Development programs.
- A process of public policy involvement and training on family issues for family members, targeting women as the primary audience.
- A process based on sharing resource materials and expertise across state lines to strengthen the program.
- A curriculum based on leadership with the purpose of increasing involvement in community affairs.
- A process that teaches participants to be teachers of adults and coaches them as they gain skill and experience.
- A negotiated time commitment by training recipients to work in the FCL program as trainer, organizer, or board member in return for training received.
- A funding source that partially reimburses expenses for FCL-related activities.

The Past

The Family Community Leadership (FCL) program began in 1972 when Charlene Warren, a board member of the National Extension Homemakers Council (NEHC), participated in an NEHC leadership development program. Impressed by the potential of such training, she began a search for funds to expand the program. Discussions with Lorna Butler and Bob Howell, community development specialists at Washington State University, broadened the concept and lead to the involvement of program leaders, administrators, and specialists in Extension home economics and community development in the Northwest, as well as representatives of the Farm Foundation, the U.S. Departments of Agriculture/Science and Education Administration, officers of the NEHC Board, and representatives of AAUW, BPW, YWCA, Women in Farm Economics, and others.

Assisted by a grant from the Western Rural Development Center, thirty people from eight states met in Arizona in 1978 to work on a regional proposal, which was the beginning of an eventual grant application to the W. K. Kellogg Foundation. The final application for a six-year program in six states was submitted in 1979 by the Western Regional Training Committee of NEHC, and the Western Rural Development Center on behalf of the Extension Services in

Alaska, Colorado, Hawaii, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington. In April 1981, the Kellogg Foundation announced a grant to NEHC of $1.89 million for the program in the six states for three years. A second grant, awarded in August 1984, secured a substantial share of the funding for three more years.

A board of directors, representing each participating state and both sponsoring groups, set policy, managed the funds, and hired staff to implement the program. Carol Culler was appointed regional director for FCL, with offices and staff in the Western Rural Development Center (WRDC). Accounting services and administration of grant funds were also handled by the center, through the auspices of the Oregon State University Foundation.

Each of the six participating states developed a policy board, with representation from both sponsoring groups, and in some states, developed a third group, volunteers-at-large, which managed the program.

Mistakes occurred, and both bad and good decisions were made, but mostly the two groups learned to work together, to make decisions together, and to trust each other. They learned the power of making joint decisions and of both groups winning. Homemakers learned that their funding offered them a strong voice in partnership. Extension recognized the potential and power of an organization of community educators ready to implement the program.

As the program evolved, components were established that made the educational program and the policy decision-making different from what it had been in the past. No longer was one group a teacher, with information control, and the other group a receiver. Both shared equal access to resources and information. Words such as *partnership, peer relation, equality, joint responsibility*, and *shared decision-making* became more than words; they became reality. Cooperative Extension invested staff time, in-kind support, and real dollars in support of the concept. Extension homemakers invested money, immeasurable time, personal resources, and expertise.

A curriculum was identified and materials were developed. A regional "resource pack" was completed. It is organized in a manner that allows for the continued development and inclusion of materials. An information exchange is being established to ensure the continued sharing of resources.

Regional evaluation results document individual and organization change resulting from this project. State evaluations by Marty Snider and Ardis Young have already established and identified important changes in Oregon and Washington. Case studies are being done in all states and good results are being reported. For all of those who believed in the concept and worked to make it a reality, the results are showing the expected success.

In late 1985, the Kellogg Foundation approved additional funds to support a national process to disseminate FCL to the rest of the country. The national dissemination brought together the Extension Service (ES), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and the National Extension Homemakers Council (NEHC) with the original six states. The Extension service provided a half-time person for a year with national responsibilities for FCL dissemination. NEHC established a national vice president position to give leadership to FCL. In addition, NEHC agreed to copyright the FCL logo and authorize its use in new states. A national FCL Dissemination Workshop in 1986 brought together 260 people from 48 states and Guam. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation announced its willingness to provide up to $50,000 per state to support FCL program development in other states.

The Present

Forty-two states and Guam have each received at least $2,000 from the FCL dissemination funds in support of planning and start-up expenses. All forty-four eligible states plus Guam have indicated their intention to submit proposals for additional Kellogg funds. Proposals are beginning to be received, and they should continue to be submitted through 1988.

The Future

New states will develop innovative educational programs, develop new materials, and reach new audiences. The FCL program has emphasized the sharing of ideas, materials, and approaches. A continuation of those effects will enhance the future successes of FCL.

The program has opened up new opportunities for collaboration between Extension Homemakers and Cooperative Extension. It has allowed for the sharing of resources — both materials and people. It has allowed for the growth of leadership skills, public policy analysis, communication and listening skills, and teaching skills. It has made positive changes in the values and lives of individuals and groups. It has brought change to both of the sponsoring organizations.

FCL has made visible and invisible changes. Education is difficult to measure, and change can sometimes be slow. It is not easy to guess how things might have been or always to be able to see how things are. We cannot even guess at the potential that has been missed and that remains untapped. FCL can leave a legacy that will allow others to continue to dream. They need to dream not only old dreams but also new ones. They must continue to build programs by taking risks in the same manner as those who went before them. They must continue the shared relationship, searching hard to take the best each has to give and to initiate and develop what is not there.

Family Community Leadership has had a rich beginning. It is currently strong and successful. It offers the continued possibility for a long and lasting shared relationship between Cooperative Extension and Extension Homemakers that can educate and strengthen our future citizens and communities.